

4950
A
D E F E N C E

O F T H E

Protestant Ministers Mission:

S H E W I N G

That 'tis the Right of all Christian Churches to chuse their own Ministers; and that the Popish Pretence of a Regular, Uninterrupted Succession from the Apostle *Peter*, thro the Church of *Rome*, is a groundless Fancy, which can never be proved; and therefore no way necessary to render any Ministerial Authority Regular, or Administrations Valid.

B E I N G

A R E P L Y to Mr. HOLLAND's Considerations of a Sermon, entitled, *A Vindication of the Protestant Ministers Mission.*

By JOHN DAVISSON.

Πρῶτος ἐν ἐγὼ φημι Πέτρος ἐπίσκοπον χειροτονεῖσθαι ὡς ἐν τοῖς προ-
λαβόντων ἅμα πάντες διελθόμεθα, ἐν πάσῃ συνεκλήσῃ συνεινένῃ
ὑπὸ παντὸς τῷ λαῷ ἐκκληγεμένοι, Apostol. Constit. Lib.
VIII. C. IV.

Et cum dicant de Deo eos non esse, sed esse de Antichristi Spiritu; quomodo gerunt spiritualia, & divina tractunt, qui hostes Dei sint, & quorum pectora obsederit Spiritus Antichristi? Cyp. Ep. LXXIII. Edit. Oxon.

Nos autem dicimus eos qui inde veniunt, non rebaptizari apud nos, sed baptizari. Neque enim illic accipiunt aliquid, ubi nihil est, veniunt ad nos ut hic accipiant, ubi & gratia & veritas omnis est, Id. Ep. LXXI. Ed. Oxon.

L O N D O N :

Printed, and are to be Sold by A. WARD, at the King's-Arms in Little-Britain; and R. FORD, at the Angel in the Poultry. M DCC. XXI.



A DEFENCE of the Protestant Ministers Mission.



BEING Mr. *Holland's* Considerations of my Sermon, tho very learned, carry in them their own Confutation, the intelligent Reader may wonder why I give him the trouble of this Reply. To give him satisfaction in this point, I assure him, 'tis not because I apprehend any considerable Strength in them, to invalidate any one Argument in my Sermon; but to undeceive the simple and credulous, who, perhaps, from his confident way of Writing, may think there is really somewhat of Strength in what he says, when there is very little to the purpose said by him: unless we will take his Railing for Reason, his insipid Reflections for solid Arguments, and his bare *ipse dixit* for Proofs.

The Reader may observe, that the whole Performance is stuff'd either with learned Mistakes of the Question in debate; or with strong Affirmations, without Reason to support them; or with fulsom satyrical Reflections on his Adversary's Weakness and Want of Learning. By the last, I presume, he aims at aggrandizing

dizing his own superior Genius and Learning, and thereby to blacken his Opponent, and expose him to the Contempt of his Readers; remembering, 'tis like, that Popish Maxim, * *Throw Dirt enough, and some will stick.* But Mr. H. may miss of his Aim therein; for tho Fools and Bigots may be deluded, and caught with Chaff, Wise and Considerate Men will contemn it: for Men of Wisdom and Understanding judge of Mens Performances by the clear and solid Reasons they use to demonstrate the Truth which they contend for; and not by the empty Querks of Wit, and hard Words, which they use to render their Adversaries odious. Mr. H. may please himself with this his way of Writing, I shall neither envy him the Honour he will get thereby, nor imitate him therein.

But lest Mr. H. should charge me with the *Want of Gratitude*, as well as the *Want of Sense and Learning*, I am obliged to take particular notice of his Civility towards me in his *Title Page*. Mr. H. is not content that the World should know only my Name, but my Profession, and Place of Abode also. Was I satisfy'd that Mr. H. intended me Honour by his thus drawing me out of Obscurity, that the true Lovers of the Protestant Reformation might know where the sincere, tho weak Defender of the true Protestant Ministry might be heard of, I would as publicly render him my grateful Acknowledgments; but I fear, by what follows, that his Design thereby was diametrically opposite to this. But be that as it will; 'tis plain that his *Title Page* is calculated effectually to prejudice the Minds both of his Readers and mine, and thereby to prevent the free and impartial Search after Truth: not considering that Truth is Truth, from what hand soever it come.

Mr. H. knows well, that if he can but stigmatize his Antagonist, and dress him up as an Heretick, *i. e.* an Opposer of common and receiv'd Opinions, he shall effectually leaven the Minds of unthinking Bigots against the clearest Evidence of Truth. For such is the Bigotry of many in our day, that common and receiv'd Opinions must not be exposed, much less laid aside, tho contrary to the Sense and Reason of Man-

* *Fortiter calumniare, aliquid hærebit.*

kind. Hence 'tis, that we find the greatest Patrons of Truth infamously treated, if they chance to go out of the common Road of vulgar Opinion and Practice. This is part of my Satisfaction, that I am not alone in this coarse Treatment, which this angry Gent. is pleased to give me; my Betters, who have gone before me, have tasted of this same sour Sauce.

While I am viewing Mr. *H.*'s Outworks, the Reader will not think it altogether foreign to my Purpose, if I point to him a grand Error in his Fortifications; a Mistake which is not common for so learned a Man as Mr. *H.* to make. To strengthen himself against the Attack of his Adversary, or to make his credulous Reader believe he is secure, he has pick'd up, and curtail'd two Sentences from St. *Cyprian*, and set them in his Front. Herein is his Mistake, that instead of adorning his Frontispiece therewith, and adding any weight or strength to his Considerations, he has thereby laid himself open, and has shown his Enemy the Place where he may be with safety attack'd, his own Artillery turn'd upon him, and be blown up with his own Mines. For these two Sentences, as they stand in *Cyprian*, are as contrary to Mr. *H.*'s Doctrine and Purpose, as any thing can be. For the first of them, *i. e.* *Suffr.* 79. p. 242. declares, That the Baptism of Hereticks and Schismaticks, and particularly the Baptism of *Novatian* the Heretick and Schismatick, is invalid, and therefore the Council decreed, that all baptiz'd by them shall be re-baptiz'd; which falls flat upon Mr. *H.*'s Cause, and ruins it at once. For if the Baptism of the *Novatian* Hereticks was invalid, as *Cyprian* maintain'd, in that Epistle to *Jubianus*, which Opinion the Council was deliberating and determining about; then Mr. *H.*'s Line is broke all to pieces. This is apparent to every Man that reads St. *Cyprian*'s Epistle to *Jubianus*, which is *Epist.* 73. *Oxon.* & *Pamel.* Which very Epistle was read in the Council, and the Doctrine therein contain'd was confirm'd by the Suffrages of all, and particularly by that Mr. *H.* has chosen, which says: * *And therefore Hereticks, who have no Power without, nor Church*

* *Add this to what Mr. H. has set down of Suffr. 79. p. 242. to make it compleat: Et ideo Hæretici, qui nec potestatem foris, nec ecclesiam Christi habent, neminem baptizare baptismo ejus possunt.*

of Christ, can baptize no body with his Baptism. The other main'd Sentence taken from St. Cyprian, Ep. 69. p. 181. Ed. Oxon. is as contrary to him as the former. St. Cyprian is there shewing, That Cornelius was the true Successor to Fabian, and so consequently to the Apostles, and that Novatian being out of the Catholick Church, and succeeding no body, but beginning of himself, he must be a Schismatick, and of consequence all his Orders and Administrations invalid*. If this is the Truth, which Mr. H. cannot deny, then let the Reader judge how inconsistent this is with this Learned Gentleman's Hypothesis. This makes such a Rupture in the Line, as can never be shut again. 'Tis hard to conceive how he came to make this miserable Blunder. To say he might be impos'd upon by a jocular and witty Assistant, is hard; and to believe, that with his great Wisdom and Learning, he singled out these Sentences, so very opposite to his Purpose, is equally difficult: I shall therefore leave this Difficulty for the Reader to solve at his Leisure, and proceed to consider what Mr. H. has said within.

Whether this very Learned Gentleman's fruitful Invention now fail'd him; I know not (let the Reader judge) but he stoops, I think, a little below his Dignity, and picks up, and tells his Reader a couple of fine hear-say Stories, to furnish out, and grace his learned Prologue.

* *The whole Sentence, as it stands in St. Cyprian, Ep. LXIX. Ed. Oxon. p. 181. runs thus: Ecclesia enim una est, quæ una & intus esse & foris non potest, si apud Novatianum est, apud Cornelium non est. Si vero apud Cornelium fuit, qui Fabiano Episcopo legitima ordinatione successit, & quem præter Sacerdotii honorem, Martyrii quoque Dominus glorificavit; Novatianus in Ecclesia non est (Now follows Mr. H's Scrap) Nec Episcopus computari potest, qui evangelica & apostolica Traditione contempta, nemini succedens a seipso ortus est. Habere namque aut tenere Ecclesiam nullo modo posset, qui ordinatus in Ecclesia non est. And in p. 182. he says: Si autem grex unus est, quomodo potest gregi annumerari, qui in numero gregis non est? aut pastor haberi quomodo potest, qui (manente vero Pastore, & in Ecclesia Dei ordinatione succidanea præsidente) nemini succedens, & a seipso incipiens alienus sit, & profanus dominicæ patris, ac divinæ unitatis inimicus?*

1. They threatned me with it when first preach'd, and tho they had determin'd to keep it from me when printed, every where boasted of it as above my slender Abilities. Was I able to advise Mr. H. and he capable of receiving Counsel, I would persuade him, for his Reputation's sake, and the Honour of his Gown, when he is dispos'd to tell another Story to the World, that he will tell such a Story, as may carry at least some resemblance or shadow of Truth in it; for this seems to me to be very unlikely to be true. For 'twas not in the power of any to keep that Sermon, when printed, from him; for when it was out of the Press, it was presently advertised in two of the most publick and common News Papers, which come almost to every Town. And to add to the Credibility of the Story, fifty of them were dispers'd in his Neighbourhood, and twenty five were subscribed for by his own Parishoners. The Reader may now judge of the Probability of this Story, whether 'twas possible for any of my Admirers to be so stupidly foolish, as to threaten Mr. H. with it before 'twas printed, and to determine to keep it from him, after it was out of the Press, which was not in their power to do. In this Story the Reader will observe, that there were some Admirers of that Sermon; but they were, it seems, so very silly and ignorant of Mr. H's Learned Qualifications, that they foolishly thought it unanswerable, or, at least, that it was above his slender Abilities to answer. Oh the Imprudence of these People! That ever they should be so very unwise, as to entertain such low Thoughts of this Learned Rector! *Prob Dolor! hinc Jurgia! hinc illæ Lachrymæ!* What not able to answer such an illiterate Piece! Whether this is Fact or not, I am not concern'd to know; and whether by this his Learned Performance, he has not manifested to the World, that his Abilities are indeed too slender to encounter the Difficulties in that Sermon, I will not determine, lest Mr. H. should say, I am Judge in my own Case: I'll leave it to the impartial Reader to judge, whether he has not in fact, by what he has now done, verified the Opinion of my Admirers, that 'tis, at least, by him unanswerable.

2. To throw an Odium upon me, and to incense his Bigoted Readers against me, as an Enemy to the Universities, he tells him a second Story. Says he, *The Preacher* is

is said to be importun'd to print it by his Learned Audience, and after much Reluctance to have comply'd in Words to this purpose, That he should provoke both the Universities, Who told this silly Story to the Learned Rector, I know not. As to the first part of it, there is something of Truth in it: I was indeed importun'd to print that Discourse. But the last part is false: I never, as I remember, once mention'd, or so much as thought of the Universities. I did indeed question, whether some hot, inconsiderate Zealot would not be exasperated by the ungrateful Truth therein told, and give me some trouble to answer his malicious Reflections, or weak and impertinent Reasonings: but I see not any reason why those Learned Bodies, the Universities, should be provoked by any Man's speaking or writing the Truth; much less be provoked by my Sermon, which only asserts the true Protestant Doctrine, on which they themselves are founded, and on which they must stand, or truckle again to Rome.

I need say no more, let the Reader judge how handsomely these Stories grace Mr. H's Preface.

He next insinuates, That I am a disputacious Creature, and have troubled the World with my want of Sense and Learning and that I must die of myself, or else by some ignoble Hand. I should have pass'd this Contempt with Disdain, did I not see that the noting of it will deprive this Gentleman of his Triumph therein; for if my Sense and Learning in that Sermon appear so small, sure so Learned a Man, as he would be thought to be, can get but little Honour to be baffled by Arguments, which carry but little Sense and Learning in them: so that, in the issue, the Contempt which he would throw upon his Adversary, rebounds upon himself, as not being able to vanquish Arguments of little Sense and Learning. But I have the Vanity to conclude, that 'twas in reality the Sense that was found in the argumentative part of that Sermon, which indeed troubled him, and put him into this Fret.

He goes on: I will not pretend, says he, to say anything new in the Confutation of the Popular Scheme by the Author advanc'd, &c. I believe the judicious Reader will not be induced to give the least credit to the Truth of this, when he has it plain before his Eyes, that by the Stamp it bears, it must be most of Mr. H's own coining.

coining. Says he, *His Arguments are neither the strongest, nor well urg'd.* Let it be so; but it seems by the Event, that tho they are not the *strongest*, they are strong enough to stand against the Efforts of this Considerer: for he has not so much as made a breach in any one of them. He adds: *He has rais'd Objections, which have been sufficiently answer'd, without taking notice thereof.* But he has not been so honest as to tell his Reader where, nor by whom, that he might know the Truth thereof. Besides, if it was so, methinks, he might have saved himself the labour of writing so much to so little purpose; and have produced those Answers, which, with great probability, might have been more convincing to his Reader.

For a Conclusion to his *Preface*, he acquaints his Reader with the reason why he condescends so low, as to undertake to confute those already baffled Arguments: *Because some Letters had pass'd between us upon this and some other Points, &c.* And therefore, that I might not languish and die of myself, in his great Compassion, he would dispatch me with his own Hand.

So much for his learned *Preface*; by which the Reader hath a true Specimen of the following *Considerations*, to which we are now to reply.

My Text was Col. iv. 17. *And say to Archippus, Take heed to the Ministry which thou hast received in the Lord, that thou fulfil it.* Mr. H. says, *I have bestow'd a pair of curious Observations on the Words.* 1. *That Archippus was not the Name of a Man, but an Office.* 2. *That Archippus was a dilatory and negligent Minister, and therefore was to be admonish'd by the Church.* By this the Reader may perceive what Caution he had need use in reading these *Considerations*, and not take every thing upon trust from this Author; for here he has misrepresented and wrong'd his Antagonist. I won't say 'tis for want of Sense and Learning (for he thinks he abounds with both) to distinguish between a positive and dubious Sentence. I shall therefore take leave to rectify his Mistake.

I did not say that *Archippus* was not the Name of a Man, But whether *Archippus* was the Man's proper Name, or the Name of his Office, was uncertain; nor is it very material whether we determine it or not: it was a Name by which he was well known at Colosse. Now, saying *It is not certain whether it was this Man's proper Name, or*

the Name of an Office ; is not saying, that *Archippus* was not the Name of a Man, but an Office. The changing *Archippus* into *Hipparchus*, is such a curious piece of Criticism, and shews such a sharp and ingenious Turn of Thought, that 'tis pity the Reader should pass it without a Remark ; that if he should chance, hereafter, to put his Cart before the Horse, he may know how to prove that it is right by Mr. H's Rhetorical Figure, *Hyperon proteron*.

Against the 2. Observation, Mr. H. advances a pair of curious Reasons: 1. That Timothy and Titus were admonish'd by St. Paul, and that in a solemn manner, and yet not guilty of Crimes. 2. This Man Archippus was stiled in Paul's Epistle to Philemon, His Fellow-Soldier, and Beloved, p. 6. To the 1. I answer, Though it be allow'd, that every Admonition does not suppose the Persons guilty of the Crimes of which they are admonished, as in the Instances of Timothy and Titus admonished by the Apostle ; yet 'tis enough for my purpose, that *Archippus* was liable to what he was warn'd against, if not actually guilty : and this he was liable to, or the Admonition was needless ; and upon supposition of his ever being guilty, the Church had Authority to deal with him for it. For if they were to admonish him to prevent his Sin, much more when he became actually guilty. And how light soever Mr. H. makes of this Observation, and how little soever he may see in it, a greater Man than he, long ago, drew the same Observations from the Words. *Hinc observemus etiam, bonos ministros quandoque obtorpescere in officio suo, & calcaribus indigere*——*Si privata admonitio non sufficiat, per totam Ecclesiam, vel per publicam Personam, totius Ecclesie nomine, esse corripiendos**. So that the Reader may see I am not singular in my Observations, for no less Man than the famous Bishop Davenant has led me the way. But suppose we are both mistaken, the Reasons, which our Considerer produces, are not so very clear ; nor so strong, as to lay us under any Conviction of our Mistake, in supposing *Archippus* actually guilty.

As to his two Reasons, tho I am not so great an Admirer of *Postscripts*, as to give my Assent to all which

* Davenant in Col. iv. 17.

they say ; yet to please our Considerer, I will allow that the *Epistles to the Colossians and Philemon*, might be written about the same time, together with the *second Epistle to Timothy* ; and in that to *Philemon*, the *Apostle styles Archippus His Fellow-Soldier*, Phil. ver. 2. This then is the Force of Mr. H's Reason : *The Apostle Paul styles Archippus his Fellow-Soldier ; ergo, Archippus was not careless or negligent in his Office. Might not this Man be a Fellow-Soldier with the Apostle heretofore, and now be grown negligent and remiss in his Duty, and need to be admonished ? Why might not Archippus grow dilatory in his Office, as well as Demas forsake the Apostle, who was a Fellow-Labourer with him ? That Demas was a Fellow-Labourer with the Apostle, as well as Archippus his Fellow-Soldier, is plain also in the same Epistle to Philemon, ver. 24. and yet, in his second Epistle to Timothy, iv. 10. he complains that Demas, his Fellow-Labourer, had forsaken him. To me 'tis as rational to believe, that Archippus, the Apostle's Fellow-Soldier, might grow negligent, and need Admonition, as Demas, the Apostle's Fellow-Labourer, turn Apostate ; but I will leave it to the Reader to determine. But Mr. H. says, the Apostle styles Archippus his Beloved too. If this was true, it hath no more weight in it than the former ; for doubtless the Apostle loved Demas, his Fellow-Labourer, as well as Archippus, his Fellow-Soldier : and yet the former forsook him, and so might Archippus grow negligent in his Duty, notwithstanding the Apostle's Affection for him. But in this Epistle to Philemon, the Apostle no where styles Archippus Beloved : ver. 2. to which Mr. H. refers us, runs thus ; *And to our beloved Apphia, and Archippus our Fellow-Soldier, and to the Church in thy House. Must we charge this on Inadvertency or Design ? not on Inadvertency, that is to cast a Blot on the learned Writer ; nor on Design, for that will call his Honesty into question, to falsify the Word of God, only to form a plausible Argument to no purpose. I will leave it therefore to the Reader to give it what Name he please.**

But, says Mr. H. *Supposing Archippus to be worthy of Censure, it remains to be proved, that St. Paul intended a Censure, and that the Faithful had a Right to execute it. 'Tis strange and unaccountable that the Apostle should send an Exhortation to the Church to admonish, and*

not intend any Admonition thereby; and yet more strange, that the *Aposle* should send to the Church at *Colosse* to admonish *Archippus*, and yet they should not be thought to have power to execute it. Perhaps the learned Rector will unfold these Mysteries in his next. Every body knows, that the *Epistles* sent to the Churches concern'd the whole Body, either conjunctly or separately consider'd. In the latter sense, I readily allow that it is absurd, that every single and particular Member should have Authority to *admonish their Spiritual Rulers and Guides*; and therefore Mr. H. hath wrong'd his Antagonist, by suggesting and representing to his Reader, as tho he had thus proved; when, on the contrary, we asserted, and have, against all Mr. H's Efforts to the contrary, clearly proved, that 'tis the Duty of the Church, conjunctly consider'd, to admonish those their Ministers, who are negligent of their Duty.

But, says Mr. H. *Suppose our Author in the right, let us view the Epistles to Timothy and Titus; p. 7.* With all my heart. He writes in one of them, says he, about the Church of Ephesus, and to the other about the Church at Crete. Well, and what follows from thence? Why, says our Considerer, He commits to them the Powers of Ordination and Censure: as presiding in, and directing the Churches, we allow it, and not otherwise. He talks to them in the Stile of Authority; bids them command, teach, reprove, &c. and calls the faithful Discharge of these Particulars the commendable Behaviour of a Minister of Christ. And who, I wonder, denies this? I assert and maintain, that every Minister's Duty is, in the Name of the Lord, to command, teach, and reprove: But what is this to the Authority of Christ in his Churches? The Churches may have Power from Christ to chuse their own Ministers, and to censure the Negligent and Faulty notwithstanding. But why no mention of the People's Power? Because he had no occasion to mention it: this they might be well instructed in before. But why not one Line of their Authority? Because their Authority was sufficiently establish'd before. But could it enter into the Thoughts of St. Paul, by transgressing the Great Charter of his Lord, to usurp it? No, by no means; for he always acted correspondent therewith. Could he, in his grave and affectionate Letters to these Primitive Bishops, lay the

Foundation of Church Tyranny? I answer, 1. The *Apostle* did not, in these *Epistles*, designedly lay any *Foundation for Church Tyranny*; but as it has happen'd, *Church Tyrants* have, without just Grounds, claim'd Authority from these *Epistles*. 2. I say, that the Holy Scripture no where calls *Timothy* and *Titus Bishops*, who were *Evangelists*, and *Travelling Ministers, Companions, and Fellow-Labourers with the Apostle*. I deny that these two *Evangelists* were settled *Bishops* in any Churches, and challenge our Considerer to prove from Scripture that they were. Says he, *The Case is this: These Epistles were not to be consider'd in the Case; they speak the Matter too plain.* The Reader may judge now how little this Man's Considerations are to be depended on; we are ready to read, and consider these *Epistles*, and to shew that our Author has no just claim for any such *Episcopal Authority*, as he wishes for, from them. He goes on; *Did he give Timothy and Titus such Powers as no Ministers ever had, or after them ever should have?* To the first I answer, No: the *Apostles* and other *Evangelists* had the same Powers. To the second I answer, No ordinary Ministers, such as *Bishops*, or *Pastors*, and *Teachers*, have now the same Powers, as those *Evangelists, Timothy* and *Titus* had; nor will any Man hereafter ever have the like Powers, unless our Blessed Lord is pleased again to give, as at first, *some Apostles, some Prophets, and some Evangelists*: which is not now to be expected. Again, says Mr. H. *Are Ministers call'd Governours every where by St. Paul, and are the People their Principals?* I answer, *Ministers*, as *Ministers*, are not every where call'd *Governours* by St. Paul, tho *Pastors* and *Elders* are. For, by this learned Gentleman's leave, *Ministers*, as *Ministers*, are not *Governours*; there are many *Ministers* who have no People to govern: I am mistaken, if our Considerer cannot find some in his own Communion, I mean in the *Establish'd Church*, who have no *Government* of any People; and if 'tis so, he will be able to answer this profound Question himself without any Assistance.

But, says he, p. 8. The *Apostle* writes in the *Stile* of a *Monarch*, he *scourges*, he *rebukes*, he *excommunicates*, he *censures*, &c. I wonder Mr. H. should so much mistake the *Stile* of a *Monarch*. But that this Matter may be more conspicuous, we will compare the *Stile* of St. Paul, and the *Stile* of a *Monarch*. Says St. Paul, *We command*

command you in the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every Brother that walketh disorderly (a). Again: I command thee in the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ (b). Is this the Stile of a Monarch, to command in the Name of another? Will the Monarch of France say to his Subjects, I command you in the Name of the Czar of Moscow? Or is it the Stile of the King of Great Britain, to say to his Subjects, We command you in the Name of the King of Spain? Again, says St. Paul; I beseech you by the Mercies of God (c), &c. I beseech you, Brethren, by the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ (d), &c. Wherefore I beseech you (e), &c. And to the Ephesians; I Paul, the Prisoner of the Lord, beseech you (f): And to the Philippians; I beseech Euodias, and beseech Syntiche, and I intreat thee also, true Yoke-Fellow (g), &c. Is this the Stile of a Monarch? 'Tis very humble, and, I think, a little too condescending for Monarchs thus to speak to their Subjects. Says St. Paul, We are Ambassadors for Christ, we pray you in Christ's Stead, be ye reconciled to God (h). Are Monarchs Ambassadors, and do they use thus to pray and beseech their Subjects? No; the Stile of Monarchs is more Imperious and Sovereign: *Sic volo, sic jubeo, stat pro ratione voluntas.* Monarchs command, charge, rebuke, and exhort in their own Names, and not in the Name, and by the Authority of others. Monarchs don't use to cringe and stoop after this rate, and in such an humble and condescending manner to beseech and intreat to have their pleasure done. Thus we see how much the Stile of the Apostle Paul is like the Stile of a Monarch. The learned Rector's Mind runs so much upon Ecclesiastical Monarchy, that he fancies the Apostle Paul to be a Monarch. I desire him, in his next Considerations, to oblige the World so far as to tell us where Paul's Monarchy was; and whether all the rest of the Apostles were Monarchs also. If so, whether they were Monarchs of the same Monarchy with the Apostle Paul, or of some other Monarchies; if of other Monarchies, where; if of the same Monarchy, whether so many Monarchs in the same Monarchy be not monstrous, if not contradictory

(a) 2 Theff. iii. 6.

(b) Acts xvi. 18.

(c) Rom. xii. 1.

(d) 1 Cor. i. 10.

(e) 2 Cor. ii. 8.

(f) Eph. iv. 1.

(g) Phil. iv. 2, 3.

(h) 1 Cor. v. 20.

Until he hath done this, let him not talk any more of his *Ecclesiastical Monarchs Stile*.

In p. 16. of the first Edition, I said, " That a Company of Saints, or faithful Brethren in Christ, join'd together by free and mutual Covenant, to promote the Glory of God, and the mutual Advantage of each others Souls, and the Benefit of the Souls of others in the Publick Worship of God; have sufficient Authority from Christ to chuse and constitute their own Ministers." This I proved by Reason and Scripture. The first our Considerer calls a *boyish Scale of Argumentation*, and in opposition thereto, offers the two following manly Reasons. 1. Says he, *It is not rational in itself consider'd, for then there would be no need for a Scripture-Charter, &c.* According to this Notion, there is nothing rational in itself, which needs Revelation. May not a thing be rational in itself, and yet need Revelation to make it clearer? May not, nay, does not Revelation strengthen our natural Notions of things, by adding more Light? Is it not rational to believe that there is a God, and yet don't the Heathen World need a Revelation to make him more clearly and distinctly known to them? Is it not rational to serve God, to pray to him, and praise him; but do not the *Gentiles* need a clearer Light to be able to discharge these Duties right? May not a thing, when 'tis reveal'd, appear rational in itself, tho' 'tis reveal'd? The Privileges and Immunities of the Priesthood are reveal'd in the Scripture Charter; and among the rest, 'tis reveal'd, that they who *preach the Gospel, should live of the Gospel*; and that they who *receive of their Spirituals, should communicate to them of their Temporals* (a): Will our wise Considerer say, nay, dare he say, that this is not just and rational in itself consider'd, tho' 'tis in their Charter reveal'd? I am apt to think Mr. H. on second thoughts, will be of the *Apostle's* mind, and think it is rational and equitable in itself, that no Man should go to warfare at his own expence, notwithstanding 'tis revealed. So childish and *boyish* is this Reason, that I will leave it with him to consider it again, and then, perhaps, he may see, that a thing may be rational in

itself, tho it may need a Scripture Charter to make it more clearly and distinctly known.

Mr. H's 2. Reason is of the same Stamp; for, saith he, *It is not rational, unless the Society be left at liberty to chuse its own Officers: for if by the Charter the Officers be imposed, or the Society in Terms directed to chuse, then do the Officers and Power of chusing depend upon, not Reason immediately, and in general, but on the Charter of Incorporation.* Here our learned Rector divides what is not to be divided, nor is it by me divided; tho I said that it stood to Reason that such a Society should chuse their own Officers, I never said that it depended on Reason immediately and in general, independent of the Charter of Incorporation: but as it was reveal'd, it stood also to Reason in the nature of the thing, and it appear'd rational to be done. As in Civil Corporations, 'tis rational in itself, that the Freemen, or Burgeesses, should chuse for their Bailiff, or Mayor, a Man of Probity and Wisdom, notwithstanding the Charter of their Incorporation directs to such a Choice; so, tho the faithful in Christ are directed by their Charter whom to chuse, and are impower'd to chuse such by their Charter, yet it appears rational in itself, that they chuse such for themselves. I therefore still say, that 'tis rational to conclude the Saints, and faithful in Christ, have Authority from Christ to chuse, or appoint their own Officers or Ministers; notwithstanding this Author's Reasonings to the contrary.

Under this rational Consideration, we took in the End of the Gospel Ministry. That seeing the End of the Ministry was the Edification of the Church, or Body of Christ; we concluded that they, i. e. the Church, or faithful in Christ, were the best and fittest Judges of their own Edification, especially being commanded to *prove all things, and to hold fast what was good; and to try the Spirits, whether they be of God; and to contend earnestly for the Faith once deliver'd to the Saints* (a). In answer to this Head, Mr. H. says, that the Jewish Church was by God directed to Edification, and yet he dealt so hardly by them as to appoint a Ministry, with the Calling and Constitution whereof they had nothing to do, &c. What Mr.

(a) 1 Thess. v. 21. 1 Joh. iv. 1, 2. Jude ver. 2, 3.

H. says, as to the *Jewish Church*, and their Priesthood, is nothing to the purpose; unless he can shew the like Appointment for the Gospel Ministry. God was pleased to single out one Tribe of the Children of *Israel*, and to confer the Dignity of the Priesthood on them, and confine it to them distinct from the rest. And this God signify'd was his Pleasure by his Prophet *Moses*. Now seeing God had chosen a Priesthood for them, 'twas highly reasonable that they should submit to the Will of God their Legislator, and regard the Priests which he had chosen for them. If God had done the same under the Gospel, if he had singled out one Tribe from the rest, and had conferred this Honour on them, and none else were to approach the Altar, in the publick Service of God, but these, it would have been highly rational for us to have comply'd with the Ordinance of God herein; for 'tis his Prerogative to fix upon, and declare the Qualifications of those, whom he will have to minister in holy things. But God has not thus done under the Gospel; he hath left the Priesthood under the Gospel free for any Tribe, only he has declared the Qualifications of the Persons: and these are to be chosen by some or other, according to these Qualifications. Now the Contest between Mr. H. and me is not, whether 'tis rational for Men to submit to a Ministry of God's appointing, the Calling and Constitution whereof *they have nothing to do with*: but, seeing God has now left the Ministry free and unconfin'd, or not entail'd to any Tribe, but to be chosen out of any and every Tribe; whether 'tis now rational for the Church to chuse their own Ministers, respecting the Qualifications which God doth require; or whether they should have Ministers impos'd on them by others? We asserted that 'tis rational, seeing the Gospel Ministry is not now entail'd on any Tribe, that the Churches, or faithful in Christ, should chuse for themselves, and not have Officers impos'd on them by others, who have no Authority from God so to do.

Of the same nature, or worse, is that which follows. Says he, p. 11. *St. Paul, a Servant of Jesus Christ, was also a Servant of the Church, and yet (if we believe him) neither called, constituted, or controuled by the People.* This is so home a Thrust, that Mr. H. seems to crow, as if he had gain'd a Victory. But methinks a Master of

Arts should rather be ashamed of so poor a *Sophism*. Mr. H's Logick is this; *St. Paul was a Servant of Christ extraordinary, with the Calling and Constitution of whom the Churches had nothing to do: Ergo, the Churches, and faithful in Christ, have nothing to do to chuse their ordinary Pastors and Teachers.* By such Arguments and clear Demonstrations our Considerer opposes the Truth we have asserted and maintained; and then concludes, he hath confuted what we had said. As tho, because the People had nothing to do to chuse an *Extraordinary Officer, an inspir'd Apostle*, they had no Right to chuse *Ordinary Pastors and Teachers.*

Upon this weak Foundation he builds a Superstructure like it. Says he; *We now see what it is rational for God to do: we proceed then to examine whether he has done it or not.* Our Author produces an ample Confutation of his own Scheme in many Texts of Scripture, and plain Proofs that God has not done, what he, presumptuous Wretch, had prescribed to him. This is so modestly and Christianly express'd, that I cannot but admire it. But Mr. H. hath here egregiously mistaken the point. Whether he here did it thro *Passion* or *Ignorance*, I will not determine. But I never asserted what was *rational* for God to do; but what was *rational* for Man to do. I demonstrated, that what was *rational*, in this Case, for Man to do, God had granted them leave to do, and had revealed that 'twas his Will they should do. I did not *presumptuously prescribe* to God, as Mr. H. slanderously says I did; but modestly and clearly demonstrated, that what God had *prescribed* for the faithful to do, was *rational* in itself, and to be done.

That God had granted liberty to the faithful in Christ to chuse their own Officers, I shew'd from the *Evangelists Luke and John*. Against what I said from them, Mr. H. opposes what is said by the *Evangelists Matthew and Mark*, and says, *I dealt not fairly, in not producing these other Evangelists, and that I omitted them because they are against me.* But here he mistakes again; for I was not discoursing of the Charter, or Commission given to *preach the Gospel*, and to instruct Believers in all things which the Lord had commanded: I never deny'd that the *Apostles* had such a Commission given them (tho at the same time I believe the *Seventy* had Authority to preach the Gospel too) this I am very ready

to subscribe with both hands. But I was shewing with whom the Lord had left the Power of the Keys, and that, I think, I plainly manifested was not with the *Eleven Apostles* alone, but with the *whole Body of Disciples*, or with the *Church of Christ*. It is strange and unaccountable, that Mr. H. should not be able to distinguish between Authority to *preach*, and Authority to *call and constitute others*. May not some be authoriz'd to *preach*, who have no Power or Authority to *send others*? And may not the *Authority to preach*, and the *Power to send others*, be given to different Persons, by different *Charters or Commissions*? Mr. H. must know this, I believe, by some in the *Establish'd Church*, who have *Authority to preach*, but have no *Power to send others*. If Mr. H. knows this, let him justify himself in his next, in not discovering to his Reader that these *two Commissions* or *Charters* may be to different Persons. And then I suppose he will see that the *Apostles* having a Commission in *Matthew* and *Mark* to *preach the Gospel*, is no Contradiction to the *Charter* granted to the *Disciples in general*, in *Luke* and *John*, of the *Power of the Keys*. So that my producing the one Commission, and not the other, was not because it was against me; but because it was not to my purpose, not being to the Point under my Consideration. So that I will now leave it to our Readers to determine, whether the learned Rector, or the *Preacher*, is in most danger of forfeiting his *Modesty, Reason and Conscience*.

I said, that the Grant made of the Power of the Keys to *Peter* in *Matthew* xvi. 19. was not to *Peter* personally, but to *Peter as representing the whole Body of the Disciples*; and for this I gave several Reasons. To this Mr. H. replies very short, and says, *The Reasoning is weak, and the Fact false*, p. 14. As to the *Weakness of the Reasoning*, I am sure 'tis the *weakest* way of confuting, only to say that 'tis *weak*, and no more. Whether the *Fact* be *false*, is of the greatest importance, and therefore I will join Issue with Mr. H. and try this Case, whether what he says be true. Here the Reader will observe how prettily Mr. H. provides for a Retreat, if he should fail in his Attempt, and therefore waves the Testimony of *Matthew* and *Mark*, because they are not home to the Point (when my Reasoning is only from the Words of *Matthew* before noted) for, says he, *St.*

Matthew indeed does not determine the Point clearly (for him I suppose he means) nor St. Mark. But if you please to consult Luke, you'll find the Disciples of whom the Question was asked, to be the Twelve only. For this we are directed to Luke ix. 1, 10, 12, 18. Agreed with all my heart; I will consult St. Luke, and stand to his Determination.

Mr. H. gives us three Reasons, why it must be the Twelve only, of whom the Question is asked. 1. Because in this Chapter the Twelve are said to be sent out to preach 2. Because they, i. e. the Twelve, only ministred to our Saviour in entertaining the Multitude. 3. Because by our Blessed Lord the Twelve were only admitted to his Retirements, and the Question was asked in his Retirement. From hence Mr. H. concludes it must needs be plain, that 'twas the Twelve alone that Peter represented, and therefore not the Disciples in general; and from hence he boasts as if he had demonstrated, that the Fact asserted by me was false. To this I answer, That he has here made a woful Mistake in laying his Foundation; for he takes for granted, that what St. Luke relates in this Chapter were all done at one and the same time, which were at sundry Times: this is manifest in the sending of the Twelve, and the Miracle of the Loaves, and asking this Question. 1. St. Matthew acquaints us, that the sending of the Twelve was a long time before the Miracle of the Loaves, and the Miracle of the Loaves was long before this Question was asked. The Miracle of the Loaves, which Mr. H. imagines to be wrought when this Question was asked, was so long before, that the Disciples had almost forgot it, as is plain by St. Matthew's (a) Relation of this Matter. Do ye not yet understand, neither remember the five Loaves of the five thousand, and how many Baskets ye took up? Neither the seven Loaves of the four thousand, and how many Baskets ye took up? And when he was in the Coasts of Cesarea Philippi, he asked his Disciples, Whom do Men say that I, the Son of Man, am? Compare this with the fourteenth Chapter. So that the Harmony of the Evangelist (b), as Mr. Whiston observes, makes these Actions of our Saviour to be at several distinct times, which Mr. H. takes to be at one and the

(a) Chap. xvi. ver. 9, 10, 13.

(b) Matt. xiv. 15—18.

same

same time. Our Saviour sent forth the *Twelve*, and fed the *Multitude* long before this *Question* was asked; ergo, the *Twelve* were the Persons of whom our Lord asked this *Question*. Very clear Demonstration! 2. But the *Twelve* ministred to him in feeding the *Multitude*. I answer, the Text don't say that the *Twelve* alone, but Disciples: He gave to his Disciples to set before the *Multitude* (a). And 'tis more probable and rational to conclude, that the whole Body of the Disciples ministred, than the *Twelve* alone. (1.) Because of the Greatness of the Number, which were five thousand, besides Women and Children (b). Which was a Number too great for twelve Persons to minister unto, especially if we consider, (2.) That the Evening was coming on, as (c) Luke here tells us: *When the Day began to wear away, then came the Twelve and said unto him, Send the Multitude away.* And, (3.) That the Terms are changed from the *Twelve* to Disciples in general, without any reason. For the Historian says, the *Twelve* came and said to him in ver. 12. and in ver. 16. our Saviour gave to the Disciples to set before the *Multitude*; and ver. 18. he asked of them, i. e. his Disciples, &c. But, (4.) What was said above, that this Miracle was long before this *Question* was asked (if we grant they were the *Twelve* alone that ministred to him) is of itself a sufficient Answer. But to the 3d Reason, *That the Question was asked in our Lord's Retirement, and the Twelve were those alone who were admitted to be with him in his Retirements*; I answer, That 'tis a Mistake to say, that the *Twelve* alone were admitted to be with our Lord in his Retirements; and the *Fact* being false, the Consequence fails. That the *Fact* is false, appears from St. Mark's Relation (d); for he says, when our Saviour was alone, *They that were about him, with the Twelve*, asked of him the Parable. So that others besides the *Twelve* were admitted to our Saviour's Retirements; and therefore the *Question* being asked of him in his Retirements, don't prove that it was asked by the *Twelve* alone. The Reader will here observe, that our Saviour had many Disciples, out of whom he chose the *Twelve*, as St. Luke tells us. *And when it was Day, he called unto him his Disciples, and of them he chose Twelve,*

(a) Luke ix. 16.

(b) Matt. xiv. 21.

(c) Luke ix. 12.

(d) Mark iv. 10.

Matthew indeed does not determine the Point clearly (for him I suppose he means) nor St. Mark. But if you please to consult Luke, you'll find the Disciples of whom the Question was asked, to be the Twelve only. For this we are directed to Luke ix. 1, 10, 12, 18. Agreed with all my heart; I will consult St. Luke, and stand to his Determination.

Mr. H. gives us three Reasons, why it must be the Twelve only, of whom the Question is asked. 1. Because in this Chapter the Twelve are said to be sent out to preach. 2. Because they, i. e. the Twelve, only ministred to our Saviour in entertaining the Multitude. 3. Because by our Blessed Lord the Twelve were only admitted to his Retirements, and the Question was asked in his Retirement. From hence Mr. H. concludes it must needs be plain, that 'twas the Twelve alone that Peter represented, and therefore not the Disciples in general; and from hence he boasts as if he had demonstrated, that the Fact asserted by me was false. To this I answer, That he has here made a woful Mistake in laying his Foundation; for he takes for granted, that what St. Luke relates in this Chapter were all done at one and the same time, which were at sundry Times: this is manifest in the sending of the Twelve, and the Miracle of the Loaves, and asking this Question. 1. St. Matthew acquaints us, that the sending of the Twelve was a long time before the Miracle of the Loaves, and the Miracle of the Loaves was long before this Question was asked. The Miracle of the Loaves, which Mr. H. imagines to be wrought when this Question was asked, was so long before, that the Disciples had almost forgot it, as is plain by St. Matthew's (a) Relation of this Matter. Do ye not yet understand, neither remember the five Loaves of the five thousand, and how many Baskets ye took up? Neither the seven Loaves of the four thousand, and how many Baskets ye took up? And when he was in the Coasts of Cesarea Philippi, he asked his Disciples, Whom do Men say that I, the Son of Man, am? Compare this with the fourteenth Chapter. So that the Harmony of the Evangelist (b), as Mr. Whiston observes, makes these Actions of our Saviour to be at several distinct times, which Mr. H. takes to be at one and the

(a) Chap. xvi. ver. 9, 10, 13.

(b) Matt. xiv. 15—18.

same

same time. Our Saviour sent forth the *Twelve*, and fed the *Multitude* long before this *Question* was asked; ergo, the *Twelve* were the Persons of whom our Lord asked this *Question*. Very clear Demonstration! 2. But the *Twelve* ministred to him in feeding the *Multitude*. I answer, the Text don't say that the *Twelve* alone, but Disciples: He gave to his Disciples to set before the *Multitude* (a). And 'tis more probable and rational to conclude, that the whole *Body* of the Disciples ministred, than the *Twelve* alone. (1.) Because of the Greatness of the Number, which were five thousand, besides Women and Children (b). Which was a Number too great for twelve Persons to minister unto, especially if we consider, (2.) That the Evening was coming on, as (c) Luke here tells us: *When the Day began to wear away, then came the Twelve and said unto him, Send the Multitude away.* And, (3.) That the Terms are changed from the *Twelve* to Disciples in general, without any reason. For the Historian says, the *Twelve* came and said to him in ver. 12. and in ver. 16. our Saviour gave to the Disciples to set before the *Multitude*; and ver. 18. he asked of them, i. e. his Disciples, &c. But, (4.) What was said above, that this Miracle was long before this *Question* was asked (if we grant they were the *Twelve* alone that ministred to him) is of itself a sufficient Answer. But to the 3d Reason, *That the Question was asked in our Lord's Retirement, and the Twelve were those alone who were admitted to be with him in his Retirements*; I answer, That 'tis a Mistake to say, that the *Twelve* alone were admitted to be with our Lord in his Retirements; and the *Fact* being false, the Consequence fails. That the *Fact* is false, appears from St. Mark's Relation (d); for he says, when our Saviour was alone, *They that were about him, with the Twelve*, asked of him the Parable. So that others besides the *Twelve* were admitted to our Saviour's Retirements; and therefore the *Question* being asked of him in his Retirements, don't prove that it was asked by the *Twelve* alone. The Reader will here observe, that our Saviour had many Disciples, out of whom he chose the *Twelve*, as St. Luke tells us. *And when it was Day, he called unto him his Disciples, and of them he chose Twelve,*

(a) Luke ix. 16.

(b) Matt. xiv. 21.

(c) Luke ix. 12.

(d) Mark iv. 10.

whom he also named *Apostles* (a). We read of *Seventy besides the Twelve* (b); and of a Number which accompany'd our Saviour from the beginning (c). Yea, the *Apostle Paul* tells us of *five hundred Disciples*, who were *Witnesses of our Blessed Lord's Resurrection*, besides the other *Apostles* and himself (d). From hence I conclude, that after our Saviour had chosen the *twelve Apostles*, when any thing was spoken of them, or to them, distinct from the rest, they were usually distinguish'd by the Terms, *Twelve*, or *Eleven*, or *Apostles*; but in this Case under debate, they are not distinctly mentioned: but the *Disciples* in general, and therefore the *Twelve*, are not, in Contradistinction to the rest of the *Disciples*, to be understood, when 'tis said our Saviour asked his *Disciples*, *Whom do Men say that I am?* Thus we see that what Mr. H. says, that tho neither St. Matthew nor St. Mark has determin'd this, yet St. Luke has made it clear, is true, that the Question was asked of the *Disciples* in general, and not of the *Twelve alone*; and therefore my first four Reasons continue in force, and the Fact true: and of consequence my former Interpretation just and good.

My fifth Reason runs thus: "Because I find the very same Grant, in the same Terms and Latitude, made to the Church in words at length, which need no Comment to discover their Sense." If he shall neglect to bear them, tell it to the Church; but if he shall neglect to bear the Church, let him be to thee an Heathen Man, and a Publican. Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on Earth, shall be bound in Heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on Earth, shall be loosed in Heaven (e). Our Considerer tells us here, that the word *Church* stands for the *Christian Church*, or it does not. If the latter, our Author's Citation is impertinent. If the former, it remains that we enquire whether by the *Church* is meant the *Ministers*, or the *Body of the People*, p. 15. Nothing can be more impertinent than this whole Sentence. For Mr. H. owns, but a few Lines before, that I had spent some time in proving, that by the word *Church* the Jewish Sanhedrim cannot be meant; and then opposed the Opinion of those, who, by the word *Church*, would only understand the *Rulers of the Church*:

(a) Chap. vi. 13.

(b) Luke x. 1, 17.

(c) Acts i. 21, 22.

(d) 1 Cor. xv. 6.

(e) Matt. xviii. 17, 18.

and yet here he would enquire, whether by the word *Church* I mean *Ministers of the Church*, or the *Body of the faithful*. I said, that we no where find the word *Church* to mean the *Rulers and Guides of the Church only*. Nor did I, nor do I yet see any apparent Necessity to understand it so in this place; and to make Figures where there is no apparent Necessity, is the way to corrupt, and not to expound the Word of God. And in this place we cannot make the word *Church* to signify the *Rulers of the Church only*, who are but a part, and but a small part of the Church too, without a Figure. What now says Mr. H. to invalidate this Reason? Why, says he, unfortunately, if this Passage of Scripture prove any thing in this Case before us, it proves that the word *Church* does sometimes (he means one time) signify the *Rulers of the Church only*. *Risum teneas, Lector!* The word *Church* means here the *Rulers of the Church only*, because 'tis here used in that sense. 'Tis so, because 'tis so. But lest we should scruple to receive this as an Answer, he adds a farther Reason to support it. Says he, *The Persons to whom our Saviour was speaking, and upon whom he confer'd the Power of binding and Loosing, were the Twelve only*. Very well, by the *Church* is meant the *Apostles*, because the *Apostles* were spoken of under the Term *Church*; *idem per idem*. The Reader may perceive, that the learned Rector could find no other Reason for his Opinion, but what I had suggested, viz. *The Necessity such Men were under to call themselves the Church, lest the Christian People should claim their Right*.

My second Reason why the Term *Church* in this Verse could not be restrain'd to the *Twelve only*, was; "Because the Promises in the consequent Verses could not be restrain'd to them only." For 'tis plain that our Blessed Saviour speaks to the same Persons therein, as before in the Verses under debate. It would be bad indeed for the *Laitie*, if these Promises were made only to the *Clergy*, that they only should be heard, when they pray'd together; or that they only should have the Presence and Influence of Christ, when they conven'd to worship God. Can any Man of Sense believe that these comfortable and encouraging Promises of our dear Lord were made to the *Rulers and Guides of the Church only*? I hope not. I say again unto you, that if two of you shall agree on Earth as touching any thing that they shall ask

ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in Heaven; for where two or three are gathered together in my Name, there am I in the midst of them (a). Those very Persons to whom these Promises were made, 'tis plain (by the Connexion of our Lord's Discourse) were the Persons upon whom he conferred the Power of Binding and Loosing in the preceding Verse. Whence we conclude, that as these Promises were not made to the Twelve only, but to the whole Body of the faithful; so the Power of Binding and Loosing, granted in the preceding Verse, was not to be restrain'd to the Twelve only, but belonged to the whole Body of Disciples, i. e. the Church: Therefore the Body of the faithful, and not the Twelve only, must be meant under the term Church; If he will not hear them, go and tell it to the Church, &c. That our Blessed Lord was not speaking to his Apostles only, appears by the Current of the whole Chapter. For if he was not speaking to his Disciples in general, but to his twelve Apostles only; it must run thus, according to Mr. H's Sense: In ver. 1. it is said, The Disciples (i. e. the Apostles) came unto Jesus, and said, Who is the greatest in the Kingdom of Heaven? Ver. 3. Except ye (i. e. the Apostles) be converted, and become as little Children, &c. In ver. 4. Whosoever of you (Apostles) shall humble himself, &c. Ver. 6. But whosoever of you (Apostles) shall offend one of these little ones, which believe in me, &c. Ver. 10. Take heed that ye (Apostles) despise not one of these little ones, &c. Ver. 15. Moreover, if thy Brother (Apostle) shall trespass against thee (an Apostle) go and tell him his Fault, &c. If he (an Apostle) shall hear thee (an Apostle) thou (an Apostle) hast gain'd thy Brother (Apostle.) Ver. 16. But if he (an Apostle) will not hear thee (an Apostle) then take with thee (an Apostle) one or two more (Apostles.) Ver. 17. If he (Apostle) shall neglect to hear them (Apostles) tell it to the Church, (i. e. to the Apostles) but if he neglect to hear the Church, (i. e. the Apostles) let him (an Apostle) be to thee (an Apostle) as an Heathen Man and Publican. Ver. 18. Verily I say unto you (Apostles) Whatsoever ye (Apostles) shall bind in Earth, shall be bound in Heaven, and whatsoever ye (Apostles) shall loose on Earth, shall be loosed in Heaven. Ver. 19. Again, I say unto you, (Apostles)

(a) Ver. 19, 20.

that if two of you (Apostles) shall agree on Earth, as touching any thing they (Apostles) shall ask, it shall be done for them (Apostles) of my Father which is in Heaven; for where two or three (Apostles) are gathered together in my Name, there am I in the midst of them (Apostles.) The very repeating of this is its own Confutation, and yet Mr. H. must have this Sense to maintain his Cause. If then this is a Direction unto the *Apostles only*, how they should behave themselves towards one another in case of Offence; where will Mr. H. find any Rule for private Christians, in case they offend one another? To whom must they appeal, if this be a Rule for the *Apostles only*? How miserably hath the Church of Christ been mistaken hitherto, who hath taken this to be a Direction for *Christians in general*, how they should behave themselves towards one another in case of Offence. Besides, if this Power of Binding and Loosing was granted to the *Apostles only*, as *Apostles*, this Power must be at an end, when the *Apostles* died; for here is no Intimation of the Continuance of this *Apostolick* Power to any others after the *Apostles* Death. So that according to Mr. H. if here the Power of Binding and Loosing is given to the *Apostles as Apostles only*, then there is no such Power at this day in the *Christian Church*; for this Power granted to the *Apostles as Apostles only*, must terminate with them: the gross Absurdity of which Opinion, Mr. H. may consider in his next.

My third Reason, why this Binding and Loosing is not to be restrain'd to the *Apostles only*, was, "Because this Binding and Loosing was exercised by the Churches in the *Apostles Days*, and that by the *Apostles Direction*." And for this I produced several Instances. And in answer thereto Mr. H. says, p. 16. 1. It does not appear that either of these Passages respect Ecclesiastical Censures. 2. The Apostle does by no means set himself upon a level with the Brethren. 3. Supposing the Apostle to have design'd what our Author would have had him, how does it appear that the Passages above mentioned were directed to the whole Body of the faithful? That those Passages respect Ecclesiastical Censure, it does not appear to Mr. H. but I suppose it does appear to his confederate Reader from his own Suggestions. For if every Christian in common is to beware of him, and to have no Communion or Com-

merce with him, what does this imply, but that *Ecclesiastical Censure* is already pass'd, or ought to pass upon him? Says the Apostle, Now, Brethren, we command you in the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every Brother that walketh disorderly. And, If any Man obey not our Word by this Epistle, note that Man, and have no Communion with him, that he may be ashamed (a). But notwithstanding this does not appear to Mr. H. it appear'd to most Interpreters before him, that the Apostle in these Verses intended *Ecclesiastical Censures*. As to that of the Apostle to the Romans, I can't think but Mr. H. on second thoughts, will allow it to respect *Ecclesiastical Censure*, when he shall consider again for what those Persons were to be censured, i. e. for nothing less than *Schism* and *Scandal*. Now I beseech you, Brethren, says the Apostle, mark them which cause Divisions and Offences, contrary to the Doctrine which ye have received, and avoid them. For they that are such, serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own Belly; and by good Words, and fair Speeches, deceive the Hearts of the simple. Will Mr. H. say, that these vile hypocritical *Schismatics* were to be marked and avoided by common Christians in their Conversations and Commerce only, and not by the Church? Can Mr. H. persuade himself to believe this? Can he entertain such low Thoughts of *Schism*, that it don't deserve *Ecclesiastical Censure*? If he can, I am persuaded his Brethren, who call this the greatest of all Sins, even surpassing Murder itself, will censure him as having degenerated. But I imagine that Mr. H. upon second thoughts, will conclude, that the Apostle, whatever he did towards the others, must needs mean *Ecclesiastical wholesome Severities*, towards these vilest of Criminals, *Hereticks* and *Schismatics*.

2. Says he, The Apostle does by no means set himself upon a level with the Brethren. And what then? Ergo: These Passages don't mean *Ecclesiastical Censure*. Pat to the Point! But Mr. H. in his next is not quite so subtle, but condescends to speak to the Capacity of his meanest Reader, and seems inclined to grant what he cannot well deny. For, says he:

(a) 2 Thess. iii. 6, 14.

3. *Supposing the Apostle to have design'd in these Passages what our Author would have had him, i. e. Ecclesiastical Censures; how does it appear that these Passages above mentioned were directed to the whole Body of the People?* We will endeavour then to give an Answer to this Question. And (1.) It appears, because these *Epistles* were written to the *Body of the faithful, or Church of Christ*; and therefore on Mr. H's *Supposition, i. e. supposing that these Passages carry in them Ecclesiastical Censure*, they must belong to the *Body of the People conjunctly consider'd*. For tho' from the *general Inscription of any Epistle*, it does not follow that every Particular equally belongs to every one *separately consider'd*; yet it does follow, that what is spoken in general does belong to them all *conjunctly consider'd*, as *Ecclesiastical Censure* does. For what is *Ecclesiastical Censure*, but *Censura Ecclesiae, i. e. the Censure of the Church*? No body sure is so weak as to understand *Ecclesiastical Censure* to belong to every Member *separately consider'd*, against which Mr. H. weakly argues. Now seeing *Ecclesiastical Censure* is the *Censure of the Church*, and what of right belongs to them as a *Body, or Church*, from the very Notation of the Words, the Apostle's *inscribing the Epistles to the Churches, or Bodies of the faithful*, makes it appear, that according to Mr. H's allow'd *Supposition*, these Passages were directed to the *Body of the People*, and to them as a *Body* does *Ecclesiastical Censure* belong. (2.) Upon Mr. H's granted *Supposition, that these Passages carry in them Ecclesiastical Censure*, they must be directed to the *Body of the People conjunctly consider'd, i. e. to the Church*; or to no body. No Man can be so vain, as to suppose these Passages to carry *Ecclesiastical Censure* in them, and yet be directed to *no body* to put them in execution; therefore it must appear from the *general Inscription*, that they belong to the *Body of the People*: for they are directed to no body else. Tho' Mr. H. could not see, that tho' these Passages carry in them *Ecclesiastical Censure*, they were directed to the *Body of the faithful*; a greater Man of his own Communion did see it so plain, that he had no way to evade the Force of them (for the Power of the Keys to be lodged with the *Body of the faithful*) but by suggesting a groundless *Supposition, That when these Epistles were written, there were scarcely any ordinary fixed Officers then placed*

in the Churches. Contrary to what *Clemens Romanus* has assur'd us; for he tells us, that the *Apostles* constituted the *First-Fruits* of their Ministry in every place to be their Rulers and Guides. But says that Gentleman in his *Paraphrase* on ver. 14. under Consideration: Most Interpreters say, that the *Apostle*, ver. 6. and here, requires the Church Governours to use the Censure of the Church upon these disorderly Walkers: but I have shew'd it highly probable, that when this Epistle was writ, there were no such Governours settled in this Church. See Note on 1 Theff. v. 12. And (2.) says he: These Exhortations plainly are directed to all the Brethren in general; if therefore they relate to Excommunication, and such like Censures, it will hence follow, (tho it don't appear to Mr. H.) that the Power of the Keys belongs to all the Brethren in general (a).

Mr. H. goes on to consider, as he calls it, the Strength of my Cause, i. e. the Censure of the incestuous Corinthian, p. 17. This, I still say, was the Act of the whole Church, or Body of the faithful at Corinth. In the Management of this Evidence, our Learned Rector says, there is the same Mistake, or Corruption, as in all the rest, (i. e. none at all) because every Expression which is ambiguous or general, he lays before his learned Audience, and his Reader; but those that are clear and full, he smothered. Thus he never mentions these Words: For I verily as absent in Body, but present in Spirit, have judged already, as tho I were present, to deliver such an one to Satan. By the way, Mr. H. for these last words, in his Margin, refers us to 1 Cor. iii. 5. where there are no such words in my Bible, nor in any Edition of the Bible, except Mr. H's, that I can find. I only note this to shew Mr. H's Weakness, in taking notice of, and playing upon a false Print in mine. Again, St. Paul says in another place, that he forgave this Person for the sake of his Corinthians in the Person of Christ. That Man must be prejudiced to a degree, who don't see that in these words the *Apostle* did not himself pass the Censure on this incestuous Person; but as an *Apostle* and an inspired Instructor, gives his Judgment, and directs the Church what was their Duty in this case; and this I heartily acknowledge. But I hope so learned a Man as Mr. H. is able to discern

(a) Whitby on 2 Theff. iii. 6, 14.

between a *Direction* given what to do, and a *Power* or *Authority* to put that *Direction* in practice. The *Apostles* were by the infallible Spirit guided to teach the *Churches* in the Truth, both as to *Doctrine* and *Discipline*; and this, and nothing else, I conceive, is to be understood by these words of the *Apostle*, only a *Direction* given to the *Church* at *Corinth* what they should do with that incestuous Person. For presently he subjoins: *When ye are gathered together in the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and my Spirit, with the Power, or Authority, of the Lord Jesus to deliver such an one to Satan* (a); nothing can be more plain, than that they, who were gathered together, were by the Advice of the *Apostle* to censure that incestuous Person. In his next let Mr. H. tell us, who were gathered together; whether the *Body* of the faithful, or the *Clergy*, a small part thereof, or the *Bishops* alone: for 'tis too plain to be deny'd, that they who were gathered together were to deliver that Person to Satan, i. e. to censure him.

I presume the Reader need no other Argument to determine him to conclude, it must be the *Body* of the People who were gathered together, and so of consequence must see by whom this Person was censured. I shall therefore, for Mr. H's Conviction, give him a Paraphrase of his own words, which he looks on clear for his Cause, and which he fancies I have smother'd, by Men of his own Church, and whom he must own to be Men of *Sense* and *Learning*, and not prejudiced in favour of my Opinion; but led by the Force of Truth itself. Says one, *The Sense of these words, ver. 3, 4. seems to run thus; I, by the Spirit of discerning, and the Authority God has given me, have already judged that this Person ought to be deliver'd up to Satan; and therefore when you are gathered together in the Name of Christ, and have my Spirit, who also presides in your Assemblies, and there assists you in the Performance of your Christian Offices, and have the Power of Christ already to confirm and execute your Sentence, do you in his Name deliver such an one to Satan* (b). To the same purpose the ingenuous and rational Writer Mr. Locke speaks. Says he: *Therefore a*

(a) 1 Cor. v. 4, 5.

(b) Whitby on 1 Cor. v. 3, 4.

Christian Church might and ought to have censured it within themselves, it being an Offence against the Rule of the Gospel, which is the Law of their Society; and they might and should have expelled this Fornicator out of their Society for not submitting to the Laws of it, &c. (a) This being now so clear, I need say no more to this Instance, which, of itself, is sufficient to prove the thing affirm'd by me; i. e. that the Practice of the Church in the *Apostles Days*, and by their *Direction*, shews that the *Power of the Keys* was lodged in the *Church*, or granted to the *Body of the faithful*, and not to the *Clergy alone*.

What Mr. H. says of that (b) Text concerning *Hymeneus* and *Alexander*, is so trivial, that 'tis hardly worth noting; for every body must know, that what the *Apostles* did by their *Apostolick Authority and Power*, is one thing, and vastly different from what was done in the *Churches*, and by the *Churches*, with their *Direction*, which is another. This of *Hymeneus* and *Alexander*, and I may add of *Elimas* the Sorcerer, and that of *Ananias* and *Sapphira*, belong to the former; as done by the mighty Power of Christ, with which the *Apostles* were endued, for the Confirmation of the *Gospel* which they preach'd. But this of the incestuous Corinthian is of the latter, what the *Apostle* directed the *Corinthians* to do, as a *Christian Society*, walking by the Rules of the *Gospel of Christ*; the former is done by the extraordinary Power of the *Apostles* out of the Church, the latter by the ordinary Authority lodged by Christ in his Church. What Punishment the *Apostles* might inflict upon *Hereticks* and *Hypocrites* by their *miraculous Power*, is not the Case in debate; for I suppose Mr. H. don't pretend that Prelates censure any by their *infallible Spirit* of discerning, or inflict *Ecclesiastical Punishment* by any *miraculous Power* received from the *Apostles*. If he does; when he can produce their *Credentials*, and give the World the visible Tokens thereof, we may hearken to what he says: but before this is done, we desire to be excused. I see no reason to deny, that *Hymeneus* and *Alexander* were censured for their *Heresy and Blasphemy* by the *Apostle's immediate Power*, and yet still conclude, that the incest-

(a) Locke on 1 Cor. Sect. ii. n. 5. c. iv, 21. —vi. 20. Cont.

(b) 1 Tim. i. 20.

tuous Corinthian was censured by the *Body of the faithful* when gathered together, according to the *Apostle's Advice and Direction*. Thus Mr. H. may see we are not for stifling any Evidence that he can fancy any strength in, but are for setting his clear Text in a clearer light; by which it now more clearly appears, that Mr. H's Complaints are groundless. And from hence we may fairly conclude, that all Mr. H's *pregnant Authorities* from Timothy and Titus, all the *Appellations* of Honour and Prekeminence scatter'd thro the other Epistles, must yield to the true Interpretation of these Passages, which plainly carry in them the *Authority of Christ lodged in his Church*.

Says Mr. H. p. 18. *Notwithstanding the Giddiness and Inability of the People, they must be Principals*. This civil and obliging Compliment, pass'd here upon the Laity, gives them the true Sentiments of this Gentleman's Mind concerning them. And by this Hint they may see what credit they are to give to what he had said above, p. 10. *viz. That Men are Judges for themselves in Spiritual Matters, I own*. For what Capacity have giddy Persons to judge for themselves? Just none at all. They are only fit to be led and guided, as Persons not capable to guide themselves, lest they fall and hurt themselves. But in spite of all Mr. H's *Cavils* and *weak Reasonings*, and the *base Contempt* unworthily cast on the Laity, they are and will be *Principals* in this Case, *i. e.* in choosing their own *Ministers and Pastors*. And my Conclusion will be true; *That the Practice of the Churches in the Apostles days, and that by their Advice and Direction, proves the Power of the Keys to be lodged in the Body of the People, and not with the Guides and Rulers of the Church only*. Tho here Mr. H. in his wonted Candour and Justice, misrepresents his *Antagonist*, by leaving out the word *only*, as tho we attributed no Power to the Ministry; when he knows the contrary. For we never affirm'd, that the *Power of the Keys* was lodged in the *Body of the People, exclusive of the Clergy*, if any were among them, but *inclusive*. We say that the *Clergy and Laity* together make up the *Body of the People*, or a *Regular Church of Christ*; not the *Laity* without the *Clergy*, nor the *Clergy* exclusive of the *Laity*: therefore I said, that the *Power of the Keys* was lodged in the *Body of the People*, and not in the *Officers and Rulers only*.

My

My words are these, p. 14. *But tho these believe, that the Power of calling and constituting Ministers is lodged in the Church, or Body of the faithful in Christ, and not in the Clergy alone; yet they don't exclude the Elders from a share therein. They say, that in conferring Orders, the Elders, if any, ought to preside; and as Eyes to the People, they ought to direct them in their Choice: but they deny that the Elders or Clergy have the sole and only Authority under Heaven vested in them, to call and constitute Ministers independent of the Church, or Laity.* Again, in p. 32. *I said, That the executive Power was in the hands of the Bishops and Presbyters of the Churches; but that the Bishops and Presbyters did use this Discipline, by any Power of their own separate and independent of the Laity, or Church, whom they served, we deny. For the publick Censures of the Offenders were the Censures of the Churches, and not the Censures of the Rulers only.* This I said I might manifest by a Cloud of Witnesses; but I contented myself with producing only one at that time (which I thought enough, and, as it appears, too much for Mr. H's Cause) and that was Bishop Cyprian, who flourished in the third Century; and I fix'd on him as a Witness unexceptionable with our Adversary in this Cause. Against this Witness no Man can speak more trifling than Mr. H. has done. Instead of flatly denying his Testimony, or confronting him with any other Witness, and proving the contrary, he only shuffles and sneaks away.

Says he, *St. Cyprian is the main Body of his Forces, &c.* Yea, and such a Body too, tho but one, as this Hero had not Courage enough to attack; but turns tail upon him. Mr. H. says, in the Book entitled, *The Constitution, &c. of the Primitive Church, we may find all Mr. D's Knowledge of St. Cyprian.* This is not only more than Mr. H. could tell, but contrary to Truth. He goes on: *I shall therefore leave my Friend (innocent Man) for a season, and animadvert upon the Conduct of that Writer.* It would have been kind to have told his Reader in what Edition of St. Cyprian he might have found the Words cited by him. The Author of the Book, entitled, *The Constitution, &c. of the Primitive Church*, is the present Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, Sir Peter King; who in that Book has shown so much Learning, Sense, and Moderation, that Mr. H. is not able to bear: and therefore he rails at it, but durst not approach it. And first he finds fault

fault with his Lordship, that he did not acquaint his Reader from *what Edition* he had taken those Citations in that Book; then he slyly charges him with *Prevarication* thereon; and likewise intimates, that he has not well translated a Sentence taken from St. Cyprian. To all which the Reply is easy. For first, as to the Edition of St. Cyprian, what Mr. H. says is notoriously false, as may be seen in the beginning of the Book next to the Preface; where, to Mr. H's Shame and Conviction, he may find, among the particular Editions of the several Authors cited in that Learned Treatise, *Cypriani Opera folio Edit. Sim. Goulart apud Joban. le Preux, 1593. & Vita Cypriani per Pontium ejus Diaconum in fronte Oper. Cypr. Edit. Goulart 1593.* Either Mr. H. had not read the Book, and so ignorantly wronged the Author; or if he has, he has not only been unjust to his Author, but grossly imposed on his own Readers. What shall we now say to what follows? *But probably the Prevarication of the Citer made it not convenient.* Convenient for what? To acquaint his Reader *what Edition* he made use of, that he might have found the Words cited by him. This gives just ground to suspect Mr. H's fair dealing with his Authors, where he is so jealous of others, and is measuring their Honesty by his own. If Mr. H. shall say that he overlook'd this *Catalogue of Authors*, it gives his Reader sufficient Caution how he takes on trust from him any thing, seeing he can dare thus ignorantly or inadvertently to suggest of Men what is palpably untrue. As to the Suggestion, that the *Translation is faulty*: the Reader may be sure if it had been false, Mr. H. would have been noisy enough about it, and have shown wherein the Falseness of it lay; but here he is silent. 'Tis only a sly Suggestion, that 'tis unfairly translated. The learned know whether 'tis so or not; and the unlearned may take it for granted, that if Mr. H. could have mended it for his own Cause, he would not have let it pass without his severe *Animadversion*: for if Mr. H. *animadvert*s where he had no Cause, a real Fault should not have escaped his critical Observation. I shall therefore leave that Translation as it is, for Mr. H. to mend, when he is pleased to consider it again.

But says Mr. H. *It may be affirm'd, that the Power and Prerogative of a Bishop is not carried higher in any piece of*
E
Antiquity

Antiquity whatsoever, than in this Epistle. This I am glad to hear, it will strengthen the Evidence the more ; for the more clear *St. Cyprian* was for *Episcopacy*, the stronger will his Evidence be for the *Peoples Right*: for it cannot be insinuated that he spake thro prejudice, or being bribed, but *vi veritatis convictus*. For an Adversary will grant nothing but what he is fully convinced of. But here, by the way, I must obviate a sly Insinuation couch'd in this Sentence, as tho the *People's Right* was contrary to the *Right and Prerogative of Bishops*. When 'tis no such thing ; the just *Power and Prerogative of Bishops* is every way consistent with the *People's Right*. For a Bishop, by the Laws of Christ, has no Right nor Prerogative solely and alone to chuse Pastors for, and impose them upon the People without, or contrary to their Wills. *St. Cyprian*, says *Mr. H.* endeavour'd after his *People's Consent*, to avoid Scandal or Offence. True ; for it would have been very scandalous and offensive indeed for *St. Cyprian*, a Christian Bishop, to have invaded his *People's Right*. But he adds, *Notwithstanding this, he admitted some, Plebe obnitente & contradicente*. In this *St. Cyprian* halted ; nor does *Mr. H.* act uprightly in his Relation of this Action of his good Bishop *St. Cyprian*. *St. Cyprian* in this *Epistle* plainly shews, that the Lapsed or Schismatics were not to be received into the Church without the Consent of the People ; and he complains to *Cornelius* of the pains he took to persuade the People to comply to admit them, and owns that they were the more obstinate and imper-suadable, because of some, whom he had by his Easiness admitted against the wills of his People, had not behaved well after their Admission. Says he : ' We carefully
' considering and diligently examining who ought to
' be received and admitted into the Church—O my
' dear Brother, if you could be present with me when
' these wicked and perverse Men return from their
' Schism, you would see what work I have to per-
' suade our Brethren to be patient, that laying aside
' their Grief of Mind, they would consent to the re-
' ceiving and curing such as are bad : for as they are
' glad and rejoice when the tolerable and less culpable
' return ; so on the contrary, they rage and refuse as
' often as the incorrigible and stubborn, who have
' been either polluted with Adultery, or with Sacri-
' fices,

‘ fices, and yet after all remain proud, so return to the
 ‘ Church, that they corrupt those who remain sound
 ‘ in the Church. *I can scarce persuade, yea extort a*
 ‘ *Grant from my People, that such may be admitted:* and
 ‘ the Grief of the Brotherhood is the more just, be-
 ‘ cause some few, who were admitted by my Easiness,
 ‘ against the Consent of my People, have since appear’d
 ‘ worse than they were before; and have not kept
 ‘ their penitential Covenant, because they came not
 ‘ with sincere Repentance (a).

The next Citation said to be taken from Epist. 10. but is
not there according to Pamelius, Rigaltius, and Bishop Fell,
might have been found by Mr. H. in Ep. 14. of Bishop
Fell. Where Cyprian says: ‘ As to that Matter, about
 ‘ which my Compresbyters *Donatus and Fortunatus, No-*
 ‘ *vatus and Gordius,* wrote to me, I could not answer
 ‘ them alone, seeing from the very beginning of my
 ‘ Episcopacy, *I determin’d not to manage any Affair by my*
 ‘ *own private Judgment, without your Counsel, and the*
 ‘ *Consent of my People;* but when, by the Favour of
 ‘ God, I shall come to you, then we will in common
 ‘ discourse of those things which have been done, or
 ‘ which are to be done, as our mutual Honour re-
 ‘ quires’ (b). *Rigaltius on these words says, that this*
 was

(a) Nobis anxie ponderantibus & solícite examinantibus,
 qui recipi & admitti ad ecclesiam debeant—O si posses,
 frater carissime, istic interesse nobiscum, cum pravi isti &
 perversi de Schismate revertuntur; videres quis mihi labor
 sit persuadere patientiam fratribus nostris, ut animi dolore
 sopito recipiendis malis curandisque consentiant. Namque
 ut gaudent & lætantur, cum tolerabiles & minus culpabiles
 redeunt; ita contra fremunt, & reluctantur, quoties in-
 mendabiles, & protervi, & vel adulteriis, vel sacrificiis
 contaminati, & posthæc adhuc insuper & superbi, sic ad
 Ecclesiam redeant, ut bona intus ingenia corrumpant.
 Vix plebi persuadeo, imo extorqueo, ut tales patiantur ad-
 mitti: & justior factus est fraternitatis dolor, ex eo quod
 unus atque alius, obnitente Plebe, & contradicente, mea
 tamen facilitate suscepti, pejores extiterunt, quam prius
 fuerant, nec fidem pœnitentiæ servare potuerunt, quia nec
 cum vera pœnitentia venerant, *Epist. LIX. Oxon. LV. Pa-*
mel.

(b) Ad id vero quod scripserunt mihi compresbyteri nostri
 Donatus & Fortunatus, Novatus & Gordius, solus rescri-
 bere

was to be done by the whole Church, as the *Apostles* did in *Acts* xv. 22. *It pleased the Apostles and Elders, and the whole Church* (a).

If Mr. H. please to compare this with what *Cyprian* elsewhere says, he will see that it was his constant Practice to manage his Church Affairs with the Approbation of the Clergy, and the *Consent* of his People. Says he, 'Of which Affair I will not be Judge alone, 'seeing many of the Clergy are as yet absent, neither 'have they yet returned to their Place, tho late. The 'Reason of every one must be consider'd and fully 'weigh'd, not only with my Collegues, but also with 'the *whole People*. This Affair must be consider'd and 'declared with that exact Moderation, that it may be 'an Example for the Church concerning Ministers for 'time to come (b).'

And this was not the Opinion and Practice of *Cyprian* alone, but of others, as in their *Epistle* to *Fidus* is manifest; where speaking concerning *Victor*, a certain Presbyter whom *Therapius* had admitted to Communion, not only within the time prescribed for Penitents to give satisfaction, but 'without the Desire and Knowledge of the 'Church' (c), they reprove *Therapius* for it. *Cyprian* also in the Case of *Fortunatus*, and those who adhered to him, tells his People, 'That Affair should be discour- 'sed and managed according to their Judgment, and the

bere nihil potui; quando a primordio Episcopatus mei statuerim nihil sine consilio vestro, & sine consensu plebis mea privatim sententia gerere; sed cum ad vos per Dei gratiam venero, tunc de iis quæ vel gesta sunt, vel gerenda, sicut honor mutuus poscit, in commune tractabimus, *Epist.* XIV. *Oxon.* & *Pamel.* VI.

(a) Note on *Epist.* XIV. *Oxon.*

(b) Cui rei non potui me solum judicem dare, cum multi adhuc de Clero absentes sint, nec locum suum vel sero repetendum putaverunt, & hæc singulorum tractanda sit, & limanda plenius ratio, non tantum cum collegis meis, sed & cum plebe ipsa universa: expensa enim moderatione librandæ & pronunciandæ res est, quæ in posterum circa ministros Ecclesiæ constituit exemplum, *Epist.* XXXIV. *Oxon.* & XXVIII. *Pamel.*

(c) Et sine petitu & conscientia plebis, *Epist.* LXIV. *Oxon.* & LIX. *Pamel.*

' common

'common Counsel of all the Church, Clergy and Laity being together, as he had already determin'd (a).' That this was Cyprian's constant Practice, and not upon a certain time, when he might be in the Mood to humour his People, and to indulge their *proud aspiring Temper*, as Mr. H. suggests, we have Cyprian again declaring, when he says, 'That Offenders should plead their Cause before him and the Confessors, and before the whole People, when God pleased to grant Peace (b).' In another *Epistle* he tells his People, that 'when the Lord shall grant Peace to the Church, and he could return to them, all things should be examin'd in their Presence, and they being Judges (c).'

The Practice of the Church at Rome at that time was the same; when any returned to the Church, they first propos'd to the Rulers, and if they were satisfy'd, they made their Desire known to the whole Fraternity, or Church, and in, and by the whole Church, they were received, the Bishop being their Mouth. This is manifest in Cornelius his Letter to Cyprian upon the Return of Maximus, Urbanus, Sidonius, Macarius, and some others, who had been seduced by Novatian, and drawn to his Party. Says he: 'But afterward the Confessors Urbanus and Sidonius came to our Presbyters, affirming that Maximus the Confessor and Presbyter did desire likewise with them to return to the Church, and when they had been by them examin'd, the whole Matter being told to me, I call'd together the Presbyters. Five neighbouring Bishops were also there, who were likewise present to day, that the Counsel being confirm'd by universal Consent, it might be judg'd what was meet to be done about them. The Conclusion was, all this Affair was to be told to the People, that

(a) Quibus præsentibus secundum arbitrium quoque vestrum, & omnium nostrum commune consilium, sicut semel placuit, Ep. XLIII. Oxon. & XL. Pamel.

(b) Acturi & apud nos & apud confessores ipsos, & apud plebem universam causam suam, cum Domino permittente, &c. Ep. Cyp. XVI. Oxon. & X. Pamel.

(c) Cum, pace nobis omnibus a Domino prius data, ad ecclesiam regredi cœperimus, examinabuntur singula præsentibus & judicantibus vobis, Ep. XVII. Oxon. & XII. Pamel.

'they

‘ they might see those received into the Church, whom
 ‘ they had seen and bewailed long before wandring.
 ‘ And having known their Minds, a great *Company of*
 ‘ *the Brotherhood* came together, and with one Voice
 ‘ they all praised God, and rejoiced, even with Tears,
 ‘ and embraced them as tho they had been just deli-
 ‘ ver’d out of Prison—whereupon we order’d *Maximus*
 ‘ to take his Place, and the rest we received with the
 ‘ *general Consent of the People* (a).’

Thus I have, I think, undeniably proved, even from *St. Cyprian* alone, that tho the executive Power of the Church was in the hand of the *Elders*, or *Bishop*, the *Elders*, or *Bishop*, did nothing of themselves, without the Consent and Approbation of the *faithful People*, or Church; and from hence we rightly concluded, that this was the Practice of the Churches in the Primitive Ages of Christianity: and as *Cyprian’s* Testimony alone was sufficient in this Case, it would have been superfluous in a single Sermon to have added more, where no Man, we presume, besides our Considerer, would expect a multitude of Citations. But now to gratify the Curiosity of this Gentleman, and further to confirm the Truth we have asserted, we will add one or two more Witnesses. *Clement Romanus*, a *Bishop*, and that of the Church at *Rome*, who was Cotemporary, if not

(a) Postea vero Urbanus & Sidonius confessores ad presbyteros nostros venerunt, affirmantes Maximum Confessorem & Presbyterum secum pariter cupere in Ecclesiam redire: —Qui cum venissent, & a Presbyteris, quæ gesserant exigenterent. —Omni igitur actu ad me perlato, placuit contrahi Presbyterium. Adfuerunt etiam Episcopi quinque, qui & hodie præsentés fuerunt, ut firmato Consilio quid circa Personam eorum observari deberet, consensu omnium statueretur. —Quod erat consequens, omnis hic actus Populo fuerat insinuandus, ut & ipsos viderent in Ecclesia constitutos, quos errantes & palabundos jamdiu viderant & dolebant. Quorum voluntate cognita, magnus fraternitatis concursus factus est, una vox erat omnium gratias Deo agentium, gaudium pectoris lacrymis exprimentes; complectentes eos, quasi hodie pœna carceris fuissent liberati, —quapropter Maximum Presbyterum locum suum agnoscere iussimus; cæteros cum ingenti Populi suffragio recipimus, *Ep. Cyp. XLIX. Oxon. & XLVI. Pamel.*

a Companion, with the *Apostles*, advised the *Schismatical* Presbyters at *Corinth*, who were the occasion, if not the cause of the Disturbance of that Church, that they should submit to the Church, and do what was required by them; and to prevail on them, he was pleased to tell them, that this was the way to glorify God. Which is, I think, an undeniable Evidence, that *Bishops* in the Primitive Days had great Respect to the Consent of the People in what they did in the Government of the Church. Says he: 'Who therefore is strong among you? Who is merciful? Who is full of Love? let him say: if on my account Disturbances, Contentions, and Schisms are occasioned, I will depart, and go whither ye shall desire, and I will do whatsoever shall be commanded by the Multitude or People (a).' And it may be observed, that this excellent *Epistle* was sent from, and by the *Church of Rome*, tho *Clemens* was the Penman, to the *Church at Corinth*; which shews that what *Clemens* did in this Affair, he did in the Name, and by the Authority of the *Church*. For it runs thus: *The Church of God which is at Rome, to the Church of God at Corinth (b).*

Valesius, in his Notes on *Euseb. Eccl. Hist. l. 6. c. 44.* says, 'That the Suffrage of the People was necessary, when any one, who had fallen, or that had been censured by the *Church*, was to be reconciled, or received into the *Church* again (c).' And this he proves from *Cyprian*.

From my Conclusion Mr. *H.* syllogizes thus: *If this Power belongs to the People, then the Power of Ordaining; but this does: therefore that.* p. 20. To which I answer, If by *ordaining* he means Imposition of Hands, then I deny the Consequence; for the Power of Election, and the Rite of Imposition of Hands are two different things: and it does not follow, if the People have the Power

(a) Τίς ἐν ὑμῖν γενναῖος; τίς εὐσπλαγχνός; τίς πεπληρορημένος ἀγάπης; εἰπάτω, εἰ δὲ ἐμὲ εἰσάς, καὶ ἔρις, καὶ ῥήματα, ἐκχωρῶ, ἀπεμ. ἢ ἐὰν βέλῃθε, καὶ ποιῶ τὰ προσαυόμενα ὑπὸ τοῦ πλήθους, Ep. ad Corinth. i. p. 69.

(b) Ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ παροικῶσα Ῥώμην, τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ παροικῶσιν Κόρινθον &c.

(c) Populi Suffragium ad id erat necessarium, ut aliquis lapsus, aut ob aliud crimen ab Ecclesiæ Communionē separatus, in Ecclesiam reciperetur.

' they might see those received into the Church, whom
 ' they had seen and bewailed long before wandering.
 ' And having known their Minds, a great *Company of*
 ' *the Brotherhood* came together, and with one Voice
 ' they all praised God, and rejoiced, even with Tears,
 ' and embraced them as tho they had been just deli-
 ' ver'd out of Prison—whereupon we order'd *Maximus*
 ' to take his Place, and the rest we received with the
 ' *general Consent of the People* (a).

Thus I have, I think, undeniably proved, even from
St. Cyprian alone, that tho the executive Power of the
 Church was in the hand of the *Elders*, or *Bishop*, the *El-*
ders, or *Bishop*, did nothing of themselves; without the
 Consent and Approbation of the *faithful People*, or
 Church; and from hence we rightly concluded, that
 this was the Practice of the Churches in the Primitive
 Ages of Christianity: and as *Cyprian's* Testimony alone
 was sufficient in this Case, it would have been super-
 fluous in a single Sermon to have added more, where
 no Man, we presume, besides our Considerer, would
 expect a multitude of Citations. But now to gratify
 the Curiosity of this Gentleman, and further to confirm
 the Truth we have asserted, we will add one or two
 more Witnesses. *Clemens Romanus*, a *Bishop*, and that
 of the Church at *Rome*, who was Cotemporary, if not

(a) Postea vero Urbanus & Sidonius confessores ad pres-
 byteros nostros venerunt, affirmantes Maximum Confessorem
 & Presbyterum secum pariter cupere in Ecclesiam redire:
 —Qui cum venissent, & a Presbyteris, quæ gesserant
 exigenterentur. —Omni igitur actu ad me perlato, placuit
 contrahi Presbyterium. Adfuerunt etiam Episcopi quinque,
 qui & hodie præsentés fuerunt, ut firmato Consilio quid
 circa Personam eorum observari deberet, consensu omnium
 statueretur. —Quod erat consequens, omnis hic actus
 Populo fuerat insinuandus, ut & ipsos viderent in Ecclesia
 constitutos, quos errantes & palabundos jamdiu viderant
 & dolebant. Quorum voluntate cognita, magnus frater-
 nitatis concursus factus est, una vox erat omnium gratias
 Deo agentium, gaudium pectoris lacrymis exprimentes;
 complectentes eos, quasi hodie pœna carceris fuissent libe-
 ratî, —quapropter Maximum Presbyterum locum suum
 agnoscere jussimus; cæteros cum ingenti Populi suffragio
 recipimus, *Ep. Cyp. XLIX. Oxon. & XLVI. Pamel.*

a Companion, with the *Apostles*, advised the *Schismatical* Presbyters at *Corinth*, who were the occasion, if not the cause of the Disturbance of that Church, that they should submit to the Church, and do what was required by them; and to prevail on them, he was pleased to tell them, that this was the way to glorify God. Which is, I think, an undeniable Evidence, that *Bishops* in the Primitive Days had great Respect to the Consent of the People in what they did in the Government of the Church. Says he: 'Who therefore is strong among you? Who is merciful? Who is full of Love? let him say: if on my account Disturbances, Contentions, and Schisms are occasioned, I will depart, and go whither ye shall desire, and I will do whatsoever shall be commanded by the Multitude or People (a).' And it may be observed, that this excellent *Epistle* was sent from, and by the Church of Rome, tho *Clemens* was the Penman, to the Church at *Corinth*; which shews that what *Clemens* did in this Affair, he did in the Name, and by the Authority of the Church. For it runs thus: *The Church of God which is at Rome, to the Church of God at Corinth (b).*

Valesius, in his Notes on *Euseb. Eccl. Hist. l. 6. c. 44.* says, 'That the Suffrage of the People was necessary, when any one, who had fallen, or that had been censured by the Church, was to be reconciled, or received into the Church again (c).' And this he proves from *Cyprian*.

From my Conclusion Mr. H. syllogizes thus: *If this Power belongs to the People, then the Power of Ordaining; but this does: therefore that.* p. 20. To which I answer, If by ordaining he means Imposition of Hands, then I deny the Consequence; for the Power of Election, and the Rite of Imposition of Hands are two different things: and it does not follow, if the People have the Power

(a) Τίς ἐν ὑμῖν γενναῖος; τίς εὐσπλαγχνός; τίς πεπληρο-
ρημένος ἀγάπης; εἰπάτω, εἰ δὲ ἐμὲ χάσας, καὶ ἑρῖς, καὶ ῥήματα,
ἐκχωρῶ, ἀπέμμι. ἢ ἐὰν βέλῃθε, καὶ ποιῶ τὰ προσαυόμενα ὑπὸ
τῆ πλήθους, Ep. ad Corinth. i. p. 69.

(b) Ἡ ἐκκλησία τῆ Θεοῦ ἡ παροικῶσα Ῥώμην, τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῆ
Θεοῦ παροικῶσιν Κόρινθον &c.

(c) Populi Suffragium ad id erat necessarium, ut aliquis
lapsus, aut ob aliud crimen ab Ecclesiæ Communionē sepa-
ratus, in Ecclesiam reciperetur.

of Election, therefore they have of Imposition of Hands, which always appears to be the Right of the Clergy. That the Power of Election was in the People, I confirm'd by several Instances, that the *Apostles* themselves, in calling and constituting of *Officers* in the *Churches*, always acted by, and with the *Consent* of the *Churches*, and not by any *separate and independent Power* of their own. And now I will add, that Mr. H. can't produce any one Instance in the Sacred Scriptures, that they ever did chuse and impose any Officers upon the *Churches* without their *previous Consent*. I call on Mr. H. to produce his Instances for the Affirmative, or let him be silent for ever.

To the Instances which I produced, Mr. H. has said but very little to the purpose. To that of the Election of *Matthias*, Mr. H. in his usual way, not only denies that the People had any hand in it; but affirms, that the *Apostle Peter* did not speak to the People, contrary to the Text itself, which says, that *Peter stood up in the midst of the Disciples (the number of the Names together were one hundred and twenty) and said, Men and Brethren. To whom did Peter address himself? to the eleven only? No; to the hundred and twenty: and Mr. H. won't say these were all Apostles. His Citation from Grotius is no more than if Mr. H. had made the same wonder. For tho Grotius could find no such thing; Mr. H's celebrated St. Cyprian could find it, as I say. For he says, that the 'Apostle Peter spake to the People, 'for the Multitude were together in one place (a). And the renown'd Amesius could find, that it was not the Apostles alone who cast the Lots, but the whole Church. 'The whole Church, says he, chose two, 'Matthias and Barsabas, one of whom God chose, namely, Matthias; to whom Bellarmine grants the Fact, but 'adds, that 'twas by the Concession of the Apostle 'Peter (b).'*

(a) Quando de ordinando in locum Judæ Apostolo Petrus ad Plebem loquitur; Surrexit, inquit, Petrus in medio discipulorum, fuit autem turba in uno, *Epist. LXVII. Oxon. & LXVIII. Pamel.*

(b) Non soli Apostoli, sed tota Ecclesia elegit Matthiam & Barsabam, ut ex iis Deus unum assumeret, &c. Bellarm. responder, Factum hoc est ex Concessione Petri, *Bellarmin. Enervat. Tom. secund. de Electione.*

My next Instance was the Choice of the *Evangelists*, or extraordinary Ministers to travel with the Apostles, such as *Timothy* and *Titus*, *Silas* and *Lucas*. From whence we reason'd, If the *Apostles* thought the Suffrages of the Churches necessary in the choice of these Extraordinary Officers, Messengers, and Companions, and that when they were present too; much more is it necessary now in the choice of Ordinary Ministers. To this Mr. H. says, *He that don't see a prudential Reason for the People's Choice in both these Cases, is strangely prejudiced—But to conclude from this, that the People have power to constitute their Ministers, is wilder than any thing that I can at present think of, p. 21.* The judicious Reader will here observe, that our learned Considerer grants the Premises, but denies the Conclusion; than which, if any thing can be more wild, let him tell us in his next.

That we might come close to the Point, we shew'd, that in chusing Ordinary Pastors, the Churches did chuse in the Presence of the Apostles; the Apostles only presiding and directing the Churches in their Choice, but not imposing any Officers upon them without their consent. The first we mentioned was the Choice of Deacons in *Acts vi.* The Apostles called the Multitude together, i. e. the Church, and propos'd to them to look out from among themselves seven Men full of the Holy Ghost. The Saying pleased them, and they chose seven Men, whom they set before the Apostles, and on them they laid their hands, and prayed (a). Hence I reason, That if the Church did in the Presence of the Apostles, and by their Direction, chuse Ordinary Officers and Teachers, and the Apostles did not by their extraordinary Power impose them upon her; then this Power is still in the Churches to chuse their Ordinary Ministers. To this Mr. H. answers, 1. That Deacons are not in this place (b) spoken of as ordinary Ministers of the Word, but as different from them, p. 21. To which I reply, that they were ordinary Ministers of the Church, as is plain by these words; Look out from among yourselves seven Men of honest Report, and full of the Holy Ghost and Wisdom, whom we may appoint over this Business (c). Over what Business? Why, looking after

(a) Ver. 2, 3, 5, 6.

(b) Ver. 3.

(c) Ver. 1, 2.

the *poor Widows, and serving Tables*. Again, tho these were not spoken of as *Ordinary Ministers* of the Word, they were both *Ministers* of the Word, and *Ordinary Officers* in the Church. That they were *Ordinary Officers* in the Church, no Man of Sense will deny ; that they were *Ministers* of the Word also, the two consequent *Chapters* abundantly declare. But whether their ministering the Word appertain'd to them as *Deacons*, or as some of the *Seventy*, it matters not. Those Men who ministered the Word, were chosen as *Ordinary Officers* in the Church.

Mr. H. says, 2. *Supposing they were Ordinary Ministers, they were constituted by the Apostles*. But how does he make that appear, that tho they were chosen by the People, they were constituted by the *Apostles*? (1.) Says he: *They called upon the People to look out seven Men; ergo, they were constituted by the Apostles*. (2.) *They told them what number they should have, viz. seven; ergo, they were constituted by the Apostles*. (3.) *They laid down their Qualifications; ergo, they were constituted by the Apostles*. (4.) *They reserved to themselves the Constitution of them; ergo, they were constituted by the Apostles*. Learned Reasons indeed! The *Apostles* called the Church together, bid them look out some Men, told them the Number which they should chuse, laid down the Qualifications of the Men, and at last laid their Hands on those whom the People chose. Ergo, the People did not chuse, but the *Apostles* appointed these ordinary Officers. I appeal to the learned Rector himself in his more lucid Intervals, whether any thing can be more wild than this?

Mr. H. says, 3. *Allowing the Power, in this Case exercised by the People, to be never so great, it was not believed to belong to the faithful before; for then it is reasonable to think, that when they were out of humour, they would have asserted it: nor what they could demand after, for then St. Paul would never have usurped it, have acted without them, as he generally did*. I answer, the first part of this learned Reason shall go for nothing; for we don't find they were ever opposed in the Exercise of this Power, and therefore there was no reason for them to be out of humour, or to have asserted it, tho it was believed to belong to them before: and for the last part, viz. *that the Apostle would*

would never have usurped it, and have acted without them, as he generally did; I answer, the *Apostle Paul* never usurped the People's Right, nor generally acted without their Consent. I therefore would desire Mr. H. to prove from Scripture, that ever the *Apostles* did usurp the People's Right in chusing their ordinary Ministers; or that he did generally, in constituting their ordinary Officers, act without the Consent of the People. If Mr. H. prove these two things, I will give up the Cause to him, and contend no more. But I may be very sure, that he can never make these Points good. As for what he is pleased to say of and from the *Learned Beza*, I only say, that tho I have that Learned Man in very great Esteem, yet Truth from Mr. H. shall be as acceptable to me as from *Beza*. What Mr. H. has cited from that great Man, is nothing to his purpose. And if he had consulted *Beza* himself, instead of contenting himself with that imperfect Sentence which he has taken from the *Original Draught*, he would have found that *Beza* had told him so. For when *Beza* uses the words, *nihil ad rem facit*, he means, that it makes nothing to the matter he was then upon, which was concerning a Church already constituted, as will appear to any one who looks into that Epistle of *Beza* (a). The Passage in *Beza* cited by Mr. H. runs thus: 'For what is brought from the Election of *Matthias* and the Deacons, makes nothing to the cause—as against *Morellius* and others, afterwards his Followers, in the *Gallican Synod*, is abundantly proved (b).' I suppose he will see more to the purpose in the words of *Arctius*, i. e. 'It is profitable to consider the Custom of the Antients which they observed in Elections: the *Multitude* chuses, but the *Apostles* confirm. Which Custom continued a long time in the Church, that the Churches should chuse Ministers for themselves, and that those who were chosen should be presented to the elder *Bishops*, and con-

(a) Epist. 83.

(b) Quod enim ex historia electionis *Matthiæ* & *Diaconorum* profertur, nihil ad rem facit—Sicut adversus *Morellium* & alios deinceps ejus sectatores in *Synodis Gallicis* est abunde probatum.

‘ firm’d ; which *Custom*, by the Corruption of Manners,
 ‘ was also corrupted and taken away (a).’

To set this matter in a clearer light, I added the Instance of Paul and Barnabas ; who, when they ordained them Elders in every Church, and had prayed with fasting, commended them to the Church. Here I said, that Paul and Barnabas acted the same part which the *Apostle* did in the former Instance, i. e. they presided in the Assemblies, and guided the Churches in their Choice, and confirm’d, by laying on of Hands, those whom the People had chosen. In the *English Bible*, printed in the Year 1576. and dedicated to Queen Elizabeth, we read these words according to the Original, thus ; *When they had ordained them Elders in every Church by Election.* And in the Margin we have the Reason why the Translators thus read them, i. e. *Because the word χειροτονῶντες signifies to elect by putting up the Hand, which declareth that Ministers were not made without the Consent of the People.* And the Learned Beza renders it after the same manner ; *By the Suffrages of the Churches* (b). This shows, says he, that the *Apostles* exercised no such Tyranny over the Churches, as is found in the *Roman Church*. Mr. H. being so great an Admirer of the Learned Beza, that he recommends him to me to read, perhaps his Words may be of more weight with him, and therefore I will transcribe Beza’s Sentiment on these Words, which runs thus : ‘ This word [*χειροτονῶντες*] says he, is taken from the Custom of the ‘ *Greeks*, who with Hands stretched forth did give their ‘ *Suffrages*, from whence that of *Cicero*, for *L. Flaccus*, ‘ *They stretched forth their Hands.* But the Force of this ‘ *Word* is to be observ’d, that we may know that Paul ‘ and Barnabas acted nothing by their own private ‘ *Judgment* ; nor exercised any Tyranny in the Church ; ‘ nor did any such thing as the *Pope* and his Partizans, ‘ whom they call *Ordinaries*, do at this day. Some ‘ chuse rather to refer this Action to Imposition of

(a) Utile est considerare veterum consuetudinem, quam in electionibus servarunt. Eligit Multitudo, confirmant autem Apostoli. Quæ consuetudo diu in Ecclesia duravit, ut eligerent Ecclesiæ sibi Ministros electos offerant superioribus Episcopis & confirmarentur : qui mos corruptis moribus quoque corruptus est & sublatus, *Aretius in Acts vi.*

(b) Suffragia creassent.

‘ Hands,

' Hands, which thing itself is very necessary, and, un-
 ' der this pretence, say that our Call is null, because
 ' those, whom they call Ordinaries, have not laid their
 ' Hands upon us; or because we are not consecrated
 ' in the *Roman Church*. To which I answer, from these
 ' very *Canons* which they boast of, that Consecration is
 ' void which *legitimate Election* don't precede, or which
 ' is made by a Person *excommunicate*. Let 'em them-
 ' selves show even one in their whole *Hierarchy*, who
 ' hath been lawfully called, yea, who hath not been
 ' an hundred times over of right *excommunicated*, if
 ' they will abide by their own *Synods*. Therefore why
 ' should we seek Imposition of Hands from them, or
 ' what Right have they to give it to us? But we, by
 ' the Favour of God, have sure Notes of our Voca-
 ' tion, being furnished with a lawful Testimony of Life
 ' and Doctrine by our Church, and *elected by them*, and
 ' lastly by Prayer confirm'd in our Ministry; which the
 ' Lord, I hope, will bless, both Thieves and Hirelings
 ' being ejected (a).

(a) Ortum est hoc verbum ex Græcorum consuetudine,
 qui porrectis manibus suffragia ferebant, unde illud Cice-
 ronis, pro L. Flacco, Porrexerunt manus. Est autem notan-
 da vis hujus verbi, ut Paulum & Barnabam sciamus nihil
 privato arbitrio gessisse, nec ullam in Ecclesia exercuisse
 tyrannidem: nihil denique tale fecisse, quale hodie Roma-
 nus Papa & ipsius asseclæ quos ordinarios vocant. Quidam
 hoc referre malunt ad manuum impositionem, quæ & ipsa
 sit prorsus necessaria; & hoc prætextu arrepto, vocatio-
 nem nostram irritam esse dicant, quoniam ordinarii, quos
 vocant, nobis manus non imposuerunt, sive quod non simus
 in Romana Ecclesia consecrati. Respondeo ex ipsis cano-
 nibus quos jactant, irritam esse consecrationem, cui non
 præierat legitima electio, aut quæ sit ab excommunicato.
 Ostendant autem ipsi vel unum in tota illa Hierarchia, qui
 legitime sit vocatus, imo qui non sit centies ipso jure ex-
 communicatus, si ipsis eorum Synodis stetur. Nos igitur
 cur ab illis impositionem manuum peteremus, aut quo jure
 ipsi eam tribuerint? Habemus autem nos Dei beneficio
 certas nostræ vocationis notas, legitimo ab Ecclesiis nostris
 & vitæ & doctrinæ testimonio (per Dei gratiam) ornati, &
 ab iisdem electi, ac demum etiam invocato Dei nomine in
 nostro Ministerio confirmati. Cui Dominus, ut spero, e-
 jectis tum furibus, tum mercenariis benedicet, *Beza in Act.*
 xiv. 23.

I said, ' Tho we must allow that *χειροτονέειν* sometimes signify, and is used for chusing any way, yea, for the simple Appointment of a single Person; yet its most proper and common Use and Signification is to chuse by Suffrage; and so 'tis most reasonable to understand it in this place, &c.' To this our learned Considerer says, 1. It don't mean Election only. What nobody affirms, this Gentleman denies. 2. It don't mean Election by putting up the Hands. Here he deserves the late French King's Motto: *Unus contra omnes*. For in this he denies what the whole learned World acknowledge. His Reader must have strong Faith in his bare Word, who will believe him, who asserts a *Popish* Tenet against those faithful Translators of the *English* Bible above mentioned, who have translated these words thus: *When they had ordained them Elders in every Church by Election,* and tell us in the Margin, that the word *χειροτονήσαντες* signifies to elect by putting up the Hand. And to this our Lexicographers agree. Schrevelius says, *χειροτονέω* signifies *per Suffragia creō, quasi dicat, protensa manu eligo, ut in Suffragiis solebant*. Directly contrary to Mr. H. Scapula interprets it by *manum protendo & attollo, quoniam in Suffragiis ferendis manus porrigi solebant*. Symson in his Concordance says it signifies *per Suffragia creō, constituo*. Mr. Leigh in his *Critica Sacra* acquaints us, that tho the Word signifies to appoint, or elect by Voice, or Writing, or going to one side of the Room; yet it is principally to create by Suffrage, and signifies to hold up, or stretch out one's own Hand, and not other Mens Hands: 'tis *protensa manu eligere*. Ravanel, in his *Bibliotheca Sacra* on the word *Suffragium*, says, *Hinc χειροτονέειν, i. e. manum protendere, ponitur etiam Metonymice pro eligere, seu, constituere per Suffragia, vel Sententias protensione manuum significatas*. And cites this Verse under Consideration for it. And Amesius in his Contest with Cardinal Bellarmine about the Sense of this very Word, says: *Apostoli creabant Presbyteros per Suffragia, Acts xiv. 23. χειροτονήσαντες*. (a) says Bellarmine, *verbum χειροτονέω tria significare potest*. 1. *Eligere per Suffragia*. 2. *Eligere ac decernere quocunque id fiat modo, Acts i. 26. & x. 41*. 3. *Ordinare per manuum impositionem, ut apud Ecclesiasticos Scriptores*. Amesius answers, 1. *Prima*

(a) Bellarminus Enervatus, tom. secund. de Electione,

illa significatio sola est propria, & nativa, ut Bellar. ipse fate-
tur; reliquæ Tropicae: sed a nativa vocis alicujus significatione
non est recedendum, in Scripturis interpretandis, nisi mani-
feste repugnat sensui contextus. Sed nulla talis reddi ratio po-
test, cur hoc in loco aliud hac voce significaretur, quam quod
proprie sonat, eligere, scil. per Suffragia. And a little below
he says: *Apud veteres etiam Scriptores Ecclesiasticos signifi-
cat hæc vox Electionem per Suffragia. Testes hujus rei sunt
Theodorus Balsamo & Zonaras in Can. i. Olim quum popu-
lis civitatem licebat eligere sacrorum præfatos: conveniebat
ipse populus, & alii quidem hunc, alii vero deligebant illum,
&c. Eligentes extendebant manus. χειροτονία nomen hinc
sumptum, quo sic etiam Synodorum patres inveniuntur usi,
Suffragium nominantes χειροτονία. And further he says:
χειροτονεῖν is dicitur, qui præest χειροτονία, quo sensu tribuitur
Presbyteris Primariis, vel Episcopis aliquando, apud Euseb.
lib. vi. c. 43. & per Constantinum Imperatorem in vita Con-
stant. lib. iii. pag. 146. secund. Edit. Stephani, declaratur
quod sit προβίσιον τὴν χειροτονίαν moderari Electionem. The
Great Divine and Critick Aretius says, that ' Election is
' made by the whole Church, which is χειροτονεῖν, i. e. to
' declare Consent, or to give Suffrage by the Hands, as
' is also done at this day: so that Ministers are not ob-
' truded upon the Churches, but are given by free E-
' lection. It avails much to the Gravity of Election,
' that Prayers and Fasting are added thereto. So E-
' lections ought to be made with Sobriety and Reli-
' gion, of which we at this day take but little care (a).'
To these Testimonies I might add Calvin, Bullinger, E-
rasmus, Arias Montanus, and Stephens himself, to whom Mr.
H. refers me, as tho he was of his mind, who says it signi-
fies *manum protendo, attollo manum, porrigo*. Pastor is so very
remarkable in his Version of these words under debate,
that I can't but recommend it to Mr. H's Consideration,
when his Head is a little cooler. Says he: ' When*

(a) Fit electio a toto cœtu, quod est χειροτονεῖν, manibus
suffragia declarare, ut hodie etiam fit; ita non obtruduntur
ecclesiæ ministri, sed libera electione dantur. Ad gravita-
tem electionis facit quoque, quod precibus & jejuniis ad-
hibitis fit. Itaque sobrie & magna Religione electiones
fieri debent. Qua in re, parum hodie vigilamus, Aretius
in Act. xiv. 23.

‘ they had by their Suffrages chosen Elders for themselves (a) ’; referring *χειροτονήσαντες* to the Churches and People, and not to Paul and Barnabas.

Thus I have shown, by the Testimony of these great Men, That tho this Word does not always mean *Election only*; yet it does mean Election by *putting out, or up, the Hand*, as was the Manner of the Greeks in chusing Civil Officers among them, and that this is its most proper and genuine Signification; and thus our antient Protestant Translators understood it, and so translated it in the Text under consideration. And if the Author of the *Rights of the Christian Church* say true, Erasmus, Diodate, and the Switz, French, Italian, and Belgick Translators so render it:

Page 23. Mr. H. says, *If this confident Assertor will consult Suicerus, or Stephens's Thesaurus, or Pool's Synopsis, upon the place before us, he will find himself greatly mistaken.* As for Suicerus, I have him not by me, nor an opportunity at present to consult him; but we have before shown, that Stephens in his *Thesaurus* asserts the same thing with us, and so we find no Mistake from him: and Mr. H's Reader, I presume, will admire at his Confidence and Prudence, in referring us to Pool's *Synopsis*; his Confidence in so doing, and his Prudence in concealing what Pool says on these Words. That the Reader may see with his own Eyes what Reason we have to see ourselves mistaken from what Mr. Pool says, I will produce his words: ‘ This word, *χειροτονήσαντες*, sprung from the Custom of the Greeks, who did give their Suffrages with Hands stretched forth. It signifieth that these, Elders, were chosen by Suffrages. The People did elect Pastors, but, lest any thing should be tumultuously done, Paul and Barnabas preside as Moderators—— *χειροτονῶν* with the antient Greeks properly and primarily signify'd to elect, or to create by Suffrage; but at length (as many other Words) this has chang'd its Signification, and signifies only to create, or constitute, or ordain;——it is wont to be understood of any Election, even that which is made by one or by

(a) Quumque ipsis per Suffragia creassent Presbyteros, Pastor on the word *τίνα*.

a few. But in the *Election* under consideration 'tis credible, that the *Consent of the People* was given, as in that *Choice* of less Concern in *Acts* vi. 2, 3. (a)

Thus the Reader may perceive, what great cause we have from Mr. *Pool* to see ourselves mistaken. If Mr. *H.* had read Mr. *Pool* without partiality, he might from him alone have found himself greatly mistaken.

By this, and what follows, the judicious Reader may in some measure form a Judgment of this Considerer's *Honesty and Policy*. 'Tis very obvious in these his Considerations, that he affects to be esteem'd a very *learned Man*, of *vast Reading*, and intimately acquainted with *uncommon Authors*. But alas! unwarily betrays where his great Acquaintance with these Authors lies, and how far his Knowledge of them reaches. For, says he, p. 24. *Those who understand Propriety of Speech better than our Author does Sophistry, are against him entirely. Philo Judæus uses this Word of Pharaoh making Joseph Viceroy, of God designing Moses and the Priests to their Offices. Lucian uses it of Alexander making Hephestion a God; Maximus Tyrius of Darius's Horse, making him a King (b).* Very well. But our very learned Gentleman is not here so kind to his Reader, as to tell him whereabouts to find what he asserts to be in these Authors, that he might examine the truth of it. What shall we say to this Neglect? Is it the *Prevarication of the Citer* that

(a) Vox orta ex more Græcorum, qui porrectis manibus Suffragia ferebant. Significat hos Suffragiis delectos fuisse. Populus Pastores elegit, sed ne quid tumultuosè fieret, præfident Paulus & Barnabas, quasi Moderatores——
ῥηγορεύειν apud Græcos veteres proprie & primario significat eligere, vel per Suffragia creare; tandem vero (ut multæ voces aliæ) significationem mutavit, valetque tantum creare, vel constituere, vel ordinare:——solet quidem *ῥηγορεύειν* sumi de quavis Electione, etiam quæ ab uno vel paucis fit. Sed & Electioni, de qua agitur, accessisse consensum Plebis credibile est, ob id quod in re minori supra habuimus, *Act.* vi. 2, 3.

(b) Quo sensu hoc usurpat Philo, de Pharaone Josephum prorem Ægypti constituente; de Deo & Mosem & Sacerdotes constituente; tum Lucianus, de Alexandro Hephestionem mortuum Deum creante; tum Maximus Tyrius, de equo Darii ipsum regem creante, *Pool* in *Act.* xiv. 23.

made it not convenient? But to do Mr. H. justice, *Pool's Synopsis* will inform his Reader where he met with those learned Sentences. I advise him therefore, for his Reputation's sake, when he borrows from learned Authors, either to acquaint his Reader where he had them, or to steal from Authors less in hand; for *Pool's Synopsis* is too great a *Blab* to be trusted with such *Secrets*.

Before I conclude these learned Considerations on this Head, I must answer to a knotty *Syllogism*, which is this. Says Mr. H. *The Power of laying on of Hands is allow'd the Ministers by Mr. D. St. Luke in this place says, that they had the Power of Election; ergo, the People have no Power at all.* To which I answer, If Mr. H. by the *Power of Election* in his Minor, means all the *Power of Election*; then I deny his Minor, and desire him to make it good: but if Mr. H. by these Terms *Power of Election*, don't mean them *universal*, then his *Syllogism* is faulty, there is more in his *Conclusion* than in his *Premises*, and so 'tis *sophistical*. I will put Mr. H's *Syllogism* in its true light, thus: *The Power of laying on of Hands is allow'd by Mr. D. to Ministers; St. Luke in this place says, that they, i. e. Ministers, have all the Power of Election: ergo, the People have no Power at all.* Thus Mr. H's Reader may see how *sophistically* he treats him. *St. Luke* says, that *Paul* and *Barnabas* ordain'd or appointed *Elders* by *Election* in every Church. So *Queen Elizabeth's Bible* reads it.

Says Mr. H. *The Conclusion of this critical Dissertation I have not leisure for at present.* The Reader may observe, that our learned Considerer is so very busy about *Trifles*, that he is not at leisure to attend his main Business. His little Turns of Wit, and pretty Querks, might well enough grace a *Schoolboy's Declamation*; but 'tis too empty and vain for a *Polemical Dissertation*. Mr. H. may glory in it, and his Reader may smile at his Folly, and much good may it do them both. But if Mr. H. shall fancy, when he is awake, that these his pretty *Dreams*, and *Rhetorical Whimsies*, are slighted; I acknowledge it, and say 'tis because they are too silly to merit Observation.

To my last Instance, in *Acts* xiii. 1. Mr. H. says: *The Election, if we must have one, was made by the Holy Ghost, because the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Paul and Barnabas.* Can't this learned Gentleman distinguish between
Nomi-

Nomination and Election? Methinks he should not forget the Constitution of his own Church. The *King* by his Letter to the *Chapter* nominates a Person to fill up the vacant See; the *Dean and Chapter* elect, and the *Bishops* consecrate: so in the Instance before us, the *Holy Ghost* nominates, the *Church or Faithful* elect, and the *Prophets* ordain; and therefore notwithstanding all Mr. H's *Sophistry*, this will stand as a probable Instance of popular Election. Here I will advertise the Reader once for all, that this *learned Mistake* runs thro all these Considerations of Mr. H. for he frequently takes the *Bishops and Presbyters* Nomination for their Election; (when for the most part, till the *Usurpation* of the Clergy prevailed, they only presided and guided the Election, and gave their Judgment and Suffrage as the People did) and therefore because the Election is sometimes attributed to the *Nominators*, our hasty Considerer concludes, that they had the *sole Power of Election*, which is his gross Mistake, and too great a Blunder for so learned a Man as Mr. H. to make.

Thus having seen what weak Efforts he has made to weaken the Force of our *natural Notions and rational Considerations*, which are so clear to Reason, that they stand in need of no farther Demonstration, we will pursue him thro the *Maze of Antiquity*, which is the only *Subterfuge* he hath left, where he can hope to skulk and hide himself secure. Here the judicious Reader will observe what a stir he makes to raise a Dust, that he may amuse him while he slips away unperceiv'd. I said, that *Primoprimitive Antiquity* gave us this point entirely. The *Centuriators of Magdeburg* were the first I cited, who say, *That 'twas usual for the Churches to chuse their Ministers by Lot, from whence they were called Clergy, a κληρος.* In my Margin, by Mistake of the Press, was put *Cap. lxi.* for *Cap. vi.* which was in my Copy. From this Citation Mr. H. draws seven *choice Observations*, which, without any Comment, at once discover how fertile his Brain is of *learned Impertinencies*; for nothing can be more *impertinent* than some of these Observations, except the *whole Performance*: particularly 1. Observation taken from an Error of the Press, which I hinted at before, in shewing a like Mistake of his Printer. As to the 2. I need only acquaint the Reader, that in my Citation I used the *Basil Edition, printed 1624.*

His 3. Observation is, *That the Passage mangled by him is, says he, in Chap. vi. de Ordinatione.* I answer, I am glad 'tis found somewhere. I appeal to the Reader, whether I have spoiled the Sense, by curtailing it. I will gladly stand to the whole Sentence, as Mr. H. has transcribed; I see no Inconvenience in it at all: *Concerning the Custom observed, especially of many, in Eusebius, the word κληρὸς and κληρονομία shews, that it was usual for the Churches to chuse Ministers by Lot, from whence they who were chosen to the Ministry were called Clericks (a).* His 4. is, *That what Mr. D. cites as an Assertion, is a Conjecture only, and I will be bold to say a groundless one too.* The Conjecture was taken from the genuine Sense and common Use and Signification of those two Words, which Eusebius often makes use of, where he speaks of the Election of Ministers. Let the Reader then judge of the groundlessness of our Considerer's Confidence, which is plain enough to expose itself, and needs not any labour to expose it. His 5. is, *That what I extend to two Centuries and a half, I shall find difficult to prove ever practised except once.* What I extended to two Centuries and a half, was, that the Churches did chuse their own Ministers. And this I doubt not anon to prove was often practised, yea, that 'twas the general Practice of the Churches, till the Usurpation of the Clergy broke in upon the People's Right. The 6. is, *That a Choice by Lot is no more a Constitution of the People, than a Divine, or Providential Appointment, is a human Provision.* A learned Observation indeed! But a Choice by Lot is an Evidence that the People did chuse; for when by the Equality of their Voices they could not determine the Case, they referred the Matter to the Divine Arbitrament, and consented to be determin'd by the Providential Lot. For what is the End of casting Lots, but that That should be determin'd by the Lot, which could not be decided by Votes? For when the Voices of the People are equal for each Candidate, they have no other way to know what is the Will of God, but by the Lot, as in the Case of Barsabas and Matthias (b). His

(a) κληρὸς signifies fors, patrimonium, sortitio; κληρονομία, forte lego, forte deligo.

(b) Act. i. 23.

7. Observation is, *that I contradict in this Citation what I had asserted just before; here the Manner of abusing is said to give the Name κληεs; there it is the Covetousness and Usurpation of the Ministers that put it into their Heads to appropriate that Title. But I did not say before, that the Covetousness and Usurpation of the Ministers put it into their Heads to appropriate the Title κληεs. What I said was, 'That to keep the People in Ignorance of their antient Right, and to establish themselves in their Usurpation, they cunningly contrived to call themselves the Church, as tho they were God's peculiar Portion, his κληεs, distinct from the People.'* One would think that this learned Gentleman should distinguish better, and not make a *Contradiction* where there is no degree of *Opposition*. But we must pardon him, he is in haste. *The Place is too pregnant for his Leisure.* Sure Mr. H. must entertain a very mean Opinion of his Reader's Judgment, that he so often mentions this trite Excuse, of his *not being at leisure*. Either he should have given himself time to consider, or not have pretended to consider; while in reality he obtrudes crude and indigested Dreams instead of Considerations.

In p. 27. says Mr. H. *In the Compass of half a Page, and in two Citations, he winds up all his Boasts of Antiquity: tho there are Clouds of Witnesses, he only produces the mistaken Authorities of Pontius and St. Cyprian. Tho the Decrees of Councils, and the Testimony of very antient Fathers, put the Matter beyond Dispute, he does not cite any one Council; he begins and ends with the Testimony of one Father of the third Century. There must be a great Zeal for something, where Men thus stake their Honesty and their Understanding.* Tho what follows, in Mr. H's Considerations, is of a piece with what went before; yet for the sake of those who are unacquainted with Ecclesiastical History, I shall reply to these unhandsome and false Suggestions of our modest Considerer. He seems to complain of the *Paucity of Authors cited in my Sermon*. But this Complaint looks rather feign'd than real. Seeing these few Citations are too many for Mr. H. to answer, what would he have done with more? Besides, no Man, I believe, except himself, would now a days expect a Multitude of Citations from antient Fathers and Councils in a single Sermon; especially when few were sufficient to prove the point in hand. These were enough

enough for the unlearned Reader, and for the learned, (except Mr. H.) who know where to furnish themselves with more of the same kind. But he says: *I only produce the mistaken Authorities of Pontius and St. Cyprian.* This is Mr. H's way of evading the Force of any Argument, or Authority, when he can't answer it; to seem in haste, or not at leisure, or to suggest his Author mistaken. Why had he not confronted these Testimonies with others, or have shew'd his Reader wherein I was mistaken in citing these Authorities? Whether I did mistake *Pontius*, Mr. H. had *Pontius's* Words before him to examine. I said, that at *Carthage the Church chose Cyprian*, if *Pontius in the Life of Cyprian says true*; 'who tells us, he was chosen to the *Bishoprick* by the Favour of the People (a).' Mr. H. should have manifested to his Reader, that I had miscited, or mistook the Sense of *Pontius's* Words; neither of which has he undertook to do. That *Pontius* was not himself mistaken in these Words, will appear, if we consider what *Cyprian* has in this case himself declared, which will sufficiently clear *Pontius*, and also show that I was not mistaken in his Testimony. That *Cyprian was chosen by the Favour of the People*, he himself once and again acknowledges. Besides my own small Acquaintance with *St. Cyprian*, to please our Considerer, I will now produce the Authority of one, who, perhaps, might have more Acquaintance with *St. Cyprian* than Mr. H's learned self; and that is *Monf. Du Pin*. Who acquaints us, that when *Felicissimus* had seduced *Cornelius*, the *Roman Bishop*, in the Case of the Ordination of *Fortunatus*, *St. Cyprian's Antagonist*, or rather Competitor for the *Bishoprick*; *Cyprian* sends an Epistle to *Cornelius*, wherein, after he had tacitly reprehended *Cornelius* for his Easiness to be impos'd upon by those *Schismaticks*, and had expos'd the Cause of that *Schism*, he undertakes to vindicate his own Ordination, that it was legally and canonically done, that it was without Blemish, as having been substituted in the room of the deceased Bishop, elected by the Suffrages of the People in the time of Peace; protected by God in his Persecution, united inviolably

(a) Dei judicio & Plebis favore ad officium Sacerdotii & Episcopatus gradum adhuc neophytus, & ut putabatur novellus electus est, *Pont. de vita Cyp. in front. Oper. Cyp. Edit. Oxon. p. 3.*

to his Colleagues, &c. (a) And Du Pin adds at the Conclusion of this Letter, that this was four Years after St. Cyprian's Election to the Bishoprick, (b) in 254. The same Author also acquaints us, that about the same time one Pupienus, an African Bishop, giving credit to Felicissimus, and others of St. Cyprian's Enemies, writ to St. Cyprian a very disobliging Letter; wherein he tells him, that he could not, with a safe Conscience, communicate with him, because he did not look on his Ordination to be lawful. St. Cyprian answers him, and tells him he wonders extremely how he came to call his Ordination in question, after he had been elected Bishop of Carthage by the Consent of both Clergy and People, that is to say, by the Judgment of God himself, &c. (c)

Thus we see by St. Cyprian's own Declaration, that what Pontius said was true, and no mistake, that Cyprian was chosen by the Favour of the People. So that it appears, as Pontius did not mistake in relating how St. Cyprian was chosen; so I was not mistaken in citing Pontius his Authority for St. Cyprian's Election, having St. Cyprian's own Testimony for its Confirmation. That Fabian was chosen by the People at Rome in the place of Anteros, (whom by mistake I called Anterius, and placed at Antioch) is also clear from the Relation of Eusebius Pamphilus. 'When the Brethren came together in the Church, in order to elect a Bishop, and many had intention of electing several eminent and worthy Men, Fabian being present only as a Spectator; a Dove on a sudden, as they report, came flying from above, and sat upon his Head, representing the Descent of the Holy Ghost upon our Saviour in the Shape of a Dove. Upon which all the People cry'd out with Alacrity, and one common Consent, He is worthy; and without more ado, they took and set him in the Chair (d).' Here, to evade this Testimony,

(a) Quando Episcopus in locum defuncti substituitur, quando Populi universi Suffragio in pace deligitur; quando Dei auxilio in persecutione protegitur, collegis omnibus fideliter junctus, .Ep. LIX. Edit. Oxon.

(b) Du Pin's Eccles. Hist. in the Life of St. Cyprian.

(c) Ibidem.

(d) Τῶν γὰρ ἀδελφῶν ἀπάντων χειροτονίας ἕνεκεν ἡ τῆς μέλλουσας διαδέξασθαι τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν ἐπὶ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, συνεκροτημα-

ny, Mr. H. insinuates to his Reader, *That Fabian miraculously succeeded, and was not chosen by the People, as I had asserted.* Learnedly mistaking the miraculous and providential Direction, for the Election itself. For supposing the *Story of the Dove* to be true (which the Historian himself seems to suspect, by his adding, *as they report*) the Dove sitting on his Head was not his *Election*, but only the *Occasion* thereof, and to be looked on as the *Divine Direction*, or *Providential Nomination*. And Mr. H. adds: *So also in the Case of Cornelius, tho the Historian is silent.* If the words *so also* be referred to *Fabian's miraculously succeeding Anteros*, then he is not just to his Reader, in saying that *Cornelius did miraculously succeed Fabian*: for at his Election there was no such *miraculous* thing happened. For we can't suppose that any *miraculous Appearance* at *Cornelius's Election* would have been pass'd over in silence by that Historian, who mention'd the *miraculous Appearance* at the Election of his immediate Predecessor, and who is wont to mention other *miraculous Appearances ad nauseam usque*. And he who is so intimately acquainted with *St. Cyprian*, as Mr. H. would be thought to be, must needs know, that *St. Cornelius was elected by Clergy and People, in the ordinary and common way, and by no miraculous Direction*. For *St. Cyprian* in his Epistle to *Antonianus*, in favour of *Cornelius's Election*, says, that *Cornelius was made Bishop by the Judgment of God, and of his Christ, by the Testimony of almost all the Clergy, and by the Suffrage of the People, who were at that time present, and by the Society of ancient Priests and good Men* (a). Let Mr. H's Reader now judge

νων πλείων τε ἐπιφανῶν καὶ ἐνδοξῶν ἀνδρῶν τοῖς πολλοῖς ἐν ὑπονοίᾳ ὑπαρχόντων, ὁ Φαβιανὸς παρῶν, ἑδενὸς μὲν ἀνθρώπων εἰς διάνοιαν ἦει· ὁμῶς δ' ἐν ἀθερώς ἐκ μετεώρου περισερᾶν καταπλάσαν ἐπικαθεσθῆναι τῇ αὐτῇ κεφαλῇ μνημονεύουσι, μίμημα ἐνδεικνυμένην τ' ἐπὶ τ' Σωλήνῃ τῆς ἀγίας πνεύματος ἐν εἰδει πεισεργῆς καθόδου, ἐφ' ᾗ τ' πάντα λαὸν ὥσπερ ἰφ' ἐνὸς πνεύματος θεῶν κινηθέντα ὁμόσει, προθυμία πάση καὶ μιᾷ ψυχῇ ἄξιον ἐπικρῆσαι, καὶ ἀμελλητῶς ἐπὶ τ' θρόνον λαβόντας αὐτὸν ἐπιθεῖναι, *Euseb. Eccles. Hist. l. vi. c. 29. ἄξιον ἐπικρῆσαι*; fuit enim hæc solennis acclamatio in Electionibus Episcoporum, *Valesius in loc.*

(a) Factus est autem Cornelius Episcopus de Dei & Christi ejus Judicio, de Clericorum pene omnium Testimonio, de Plebis, quæ tunc affuit, Suffragio, & de Sacerdotum antiquorum & bonorum virorum collegio, &c. *Edit. Oxon. LV. & Pamel. LII.*

with

with what Sincerity he has treated him, in making him believe by his *so also*, in the case of *Cornelius*, that *Cornelius miraculously* succeeded *Fabian*, as *Fabian miraculously* succeeded *Anteros*; when, by the Silence of the Historian, and by the Testimony of *Cyprian*, there don't appear any such thing. If this *so also* be referred to the Sentence immediately preceding, viz. *Mr. D. will have it, that he was chosen by the People, so also in the Case of Cornelius*; then the learned Rector must grant, what he seems to deny. Thus we have acquitted ourselves of one of Mr. H's Charges, and have proved that our Authorities of *Pontius* and *Cyprian* are not mistaken.

The next Charge is, *That tho we pretended to Decrees of Councils, we cited not one.* How Mr. H. could write and review this without a just Rebuke of his Conscience, I see not; for 'tis a very gross Mistake, if not a downright Falshood: He could not but know, that the *Epistle of Cyprian*, sent to the Clergy and People of *Spain*, was sent from an *African Council*, with *St. Cyprian* at its Head, and not from *Cyprian* alone. It runs thus: *Cyprianus, Cæcilius, Primus, Polycarpus, Nicomedes, Lucianus, Successus, Sedatus, Fortunatus, Januarius, Secundus, Pomponius, Honoratus, Victor, Aurelius, Sattius, Petrus, alius Januarius, Saturninus, alius Aurelius, Venantius, Quietus, Rogatianus, Tenax, Felix, Faustus, Quintus, alius Saturninus, Lucius, Vincentius, Libosus, Geminius, Marcellus, Jambus, Adelphius, Victoricus & Paulus*; to *Felix the Presbyter, and the faithful People, &c.* So that this was not the Testimony of one Father alone, as Mr. H. says, but the Testimony of a Council of Bishops assembled together. There must be indeed a great Zeal for something, when Men thus stake their Honesty and Conscience. And Mr. H. might have spared that unfair Suggestion, knowing, that tho I mentioned but this one, I might have more at hand to produce, if need required. And now to show him that I did not stake my Honesty and my Understanding for nothing, I will recommend to him and his Reader, some other Testimonies from Councils, which plainly show, that the People did not only in Fact, but had a Right to chuse their own Ministers.

The great and famous Council at Nice give us their Suffrage to this Truth, in their Synodical Letter to the Church at *Alexandria*, and to the beloved Brethren, the Inhabitants of *Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis*. After they

have declared their Sentiments concerning *Arius* and his Followers, they give their Determination concerning *Miletius* and his Adherents; and as to these the *Council* say, that they had used more Lenity towards them. That *Miletius* should continue in his City, but have no Jurisdiction, neither to ordain, or to propose the Names of those who were to be ordain'd, or to appear in any Village or City upon this pretence, but that he should barely enjoy his Appellation and Title only. And as for those who had been ordain'd by him to any Function, being confirm'd by a more Sacred Ordination, they should afterwards be admitted into the Church. And if it should happen that some of those who now hold *Ecclesiastical Preferments* die, then, say the *Council*, let those who are newly admitted and received into the Church, be preferred to the *Dignities* of the deceased; 'provided they appear worthy, and the People elect them freely, and the Bishop of *Alexandria*, by his Suffrage, confirm it (a).' *Valesius*, in his Notes on these Words, says: 'They appertain to Bishops, in the Elections of whom most especially the People's Suffrages were necessary (b).'

This is also further manifest, from what the *Council* at *Antioch* wrote to the *Emperor Constantine*; they inform'd him, that *Eusebius* was chosen by the *Antiochians* and requested the *Emperor* that *Eusebius* might go thither. But *Constantine*, in his Letters both to the *Antiochians*, and to the *Council* there, refused their Request. In his Letter to the People, or Church at *Antioch*, he counsels them 'to look out for another Man, according to their Custom, and in their Election to avoid all tumultuous and disorderly Clamour (c).'

(a) Μόνον εἰ ἀξιοὶ φαίνοντο, καὶ ὁ λαὸς αἰροῖτο, συνεπιψηφίζοντες αὐτὸ καὶ ἐπισφραγίζοντες τὸ ἑὶς Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπισκόπου, *Socrus Eccles. Hist. lib. i. cap. 9.*

(b) Apparet omnino hæc verba ad Episcopos potius pertinere, in quorum præcipue Electionibus necessaria erant Populi Suffragia, *Vales. in loc.*

(c) Ὁ δὲ ὑμετέρας συνθεῖας εἶναι ἀγαθὴ γνώμη, συνεδρῶντες παρέπεσαν εἰσπένεκαδε εἰς ἐπιζήτησιν ἀνδρὸς ὃν χρῆζετε ἀποκρίσαντες πᾶσαν ἐπιστάσιν καὶ ἀτακτον βοήν, *Euseb. Hist. Vita Constant. lib. iii. c. 60. Edit. Vales.*

quest, tho accompany'd with the Suffrage of the People of *Antioch*, ' but proposes two other Persons, whom he thought worthy to be advanced to that Dignity. And tho he nominated the Persons, he left the Choice to the People, and orders the *Bishops in Council* there to preside, and by their Prudence to guide the People in their Election, according to the *Canons* of the Church, and the *Apostolical Tradition* (a). Here, according to *Valesius*, we have the true antient Form of Election of Bishops. First, they are to be nominated or proposed; then examin'd whether they are worthy or fit for the Dignity and Charge; after Examination they are elected; and lastly, when elected, they are consecrated or set apart, by laying on of Hands with Fasting and Prayer (b).

By another *Synod* at *Antioch*, we learn the same thing, viz. That the Churches did chuse their own Bishops, and refuse those who were imposed on them. In *Canon XVI*, as mentioned by *Du Pin*, they declare: ' If any Bishop who has no *Bishoprick*, invade a vacant Church without the Authority of a *Synod*, he should be driven from it, tho the People of the Church whereof he is Bishop shall chuse him.' Again they say: ' If a Bishop, ordain'd for a *Bishoprick*, refuse to accept it, he is to be excommunicated; but if it be not his fault, that he does not go to this Church, but because the People of the Church will not receive him, it is ordain'd in *Canon XVIII*. that he shall retain the Honour and Place of a Bishop (c). ' The same Author tells us, that a *Council* held at *Rome* by *Innocent I.* in *Canon X*.

(a) Καλῶς ἔν ἐιχε δηλῶσαι τῇ συνέσει ὑμῶν, τὲς τε προχειρισμένους, καὶ ἑτέρας ἑς ἂν ἀξίους ἡγήσασθαι πρὸς τὸ τῇ Ἐπισκοπῇ ἀξίωμα, ὁρίσαι ταῦτα, ἃ τῇ τῶν ἀποστόλων παραδόσει σύμφωνα ἂν εἴη· ἥ δὲ τοιούτων ἐντροπιδέντων δυνήσεται ὑμῶν ἡ σύνοδος καὶ τὸν τῇ ἐκκλησίας κανόνα καὶ τὴν Ἀποστολικὴν παράδοσιν, ἥλω θυμίσαι τὴν χειροτονίαν, Euseb. Hist. de vita Constant. lib. iii. c. 62.

(b) προχειρίζουσαι in Electionibus, est proponere ac proferre in medium nomen alicujus, ut inquiratur an dignus sit eo munere de quo agitur. προχειρισμὸν sequebatur Examinatio, deinde Electio, ac postremò Ordinatio seu Consecratio, Not. Vales. in loco supra dict.

(c) Du Pin's Eccles. Hist. Cent. iv. p. 257.

forbids those to be ordain'd *Bishops*, who have exercised *Secular Functions*, tho they were *chosen by the People* (a).

He also tells us of another *Council* at *Milevis*, which ordain'd, that a Letter should be sent to *Maximianus Bishop* of *Vaga*, and to his *People*. In that to the *People* they decree, that they should depose him, and oblige him to withdraw, and that they should *chuse another* (b).

I will add the Determination of a greater Council than all these; which I find in a Book admired by Mr. H. and cited by him, and which must be of great Authority with him, I mean the *Apostolick Constitutions*. Say they, 'We the twelve Apostles of the Lord, who are now together, give you in charge these Divine Constitutions concerning every Ecclesiastical Form; there being with us *Paul* the chosen *Vessel*, our Fellow *Apostle*, and *James* the *Bishop*, and the rest of the *Presbyters*, and the seven *Deacons*. In the first place, I *Peter* say, that a *Bishop* to be ordain'd is to be, as we have already all of us appointed, unblamable in all things, a select Person *chosen by the whole People*; who, when he is named and approved, let the *People* assemble, with the *Presbyters* and *Bishops* that are present on the Lord's Day, and let them give their consent: and let the Principal of the *Bishops* ask the *Presbytery* and *People*, Whether this be the Person whom they desire for their Ruler? And if they give their consent, let him ask further, &c.—Let him ask a third time as before God the Judge, and Christ, the Holy Spirit being also present, as well as all the holy and ministring Spirits; ask again, Whether he be truly worthy of this Ministry—and if they agree this third time that he is worthy, let them all be demanded their *Vote*, and when they all give it willingly, let them be heard, &c.' (c) I hope I have now given Mr. H. ample Satisfaction for my Deficiency in citing of Councils in my Sermon; so that in his next

(a) Ibid. Cent. v. p. 216.

(b) Ibid. p. 217.

(c) Πρῶτος ἐν ἑγῶ σὺν Πέτρῳ, ὁπίσκοπον χειροτονεῖται ὡς &c.—παντὶς τῆς λαοῦ ἐκκλησιάζοντος, ὃ ὀνομαζόμενος καὶ ἀρέσωντος, συνελθόντων ὁ λαὸς ἅμα τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ, &c. *Apost. Constit. lib. viii. c. 4.* Edit. Whist.

we shall hear no more Complaints of this nature. As for the Authority and Testimony of antient Fathers and great Men in the Church, we have also many at hand, tho we thought it not convenient to burden that Sermon with them. This is a Matter so plain in History, and so generally confessed and acknowledged on all hands, that I least expected an Attack on this side, of any in my Sermon. But seeing Mr. H. has made it necessary, to give his Reader Satisfaction, and mine a further Confirmation, I will produce some antient and modern Authorities for this Truth, that the People in the Primitive Days did elect their own Ministers, or Rulers.

I shall begin with *Clemens Romanus*, who, in his famous *Epistle* to the *Corinthians*, acquaints us, that Bishops were constituted by the Consent of the whole Church (a). This *Clement* being a Companion or Attendant on the Apostle *Paul*, was well acquainted with the Manner of the Apostles constituting Officers in the Churches.

Ignatius, in his *Epistle* to the *Philadelphian Church*, exhorts them to chuse a Deacon (b), and send him to the Church at *Antioch*. He tells them, it behoved them as a Church of God so to do, i. e. to chuse a Deacon, that he might go thither on a Divine Embassy: and this they might do in the Name of the Lord; for some of their neighbouring Churches had sent their Bishops, and some their Presbyters and Deacons.

Gregory Nazianzen, in his *Oration* in Vindication of *Atbanasius's* Ordination, says, That it was according to Apostolick Constitution, and not by Force and Violence, according to the corrupt Example, which had of late prevailed; but he was chosen by the Suffrages of all the People (c).!

The Centuriators say, ' That neither the Apostles, nor other Ministers of the Church, did assume to themselves alone the Power of chusing and ordaining Pres-

(a) Συνευδοκησάσης Εκκλησίας πλούς, Clem. Epist. i. p. 57.

(b) Πρέπον ἐστὶν ὑμῖν ὡς ἐκκλησία Θεῷ χειροτονῆσαι διάκονον· θέλωσιν ὃ ὑμῖν ἐκ ἐστὶν ἀδύνατον ὑπὲρ ὀνόματος Θεοῦ.

(c) Ψήφω τὸ λαὸν πάντες.

' byters and Deacons ; but they were chosen with the Consent of the whole Church, and by their Suffrage (a).'

That great Antiquary and Historian *Du Pin*, in his Ecclesiastical History, gives us this Case so very plain and full, that we need no farther Proof. Says he, ' They, i. e. the Churches, took great care in the Choice of their Ministers, to elect such Persons, whose Lives and Conversations were unblamable. After the Death of those who had been ordain'd by the Apostles, the People elected (b). ' He also says, ' That when a Bishop died, all the Bishops of that Province were called together to ordain [not to chuse a Successor] in his room. He was commonly chosen by the Clergy and People (c). '

The Author of the *Rights of the Christian Church* has made a choice Collection to my hand, which for the Reader's sake I will transcribe. Says he, ' Of the Truth of this, *Clemens Romanus*, [the same we mention'd above] a Cotemporary, if not a Companion of the Apostles, is a Witness ; and Pope *Anacletus*, who lived not long after, affirms this Right belongs to the spiritual People and good Priests. And there is no Instance in the three first Centuries, of any one being made Bishop, except by the Election of the whole Church. And this Practice continued, with little or no Interruption, for many Ages after ; and even in *Rome* itself, the People, till 1147, elected their Bishop : and the famous Council of *Nice*, in a Synodical Epistle to the Church of *Alexandria*, forbids any to be ordain'd Bishop without the Election of the People : and the Council of *Constantinople* 382, in an Epistle to *Damasus*, and others, say, that they ordained *Nestarius*, *cuncta decernente Civitate*, and *Flavianus*, *omni Ecclesia decernente*. And the first Canon of the fourth Council of *Carthage*, 394, says, a Bishop is to be ordained, *cum omni consensu Clericorum & Laicorum*. And another Coun-

(a) Neque Apostolos, neque alios Ecclesiæ Ministros sibi solis sumpsisse potestatem eligendi & ordinandi Presbyteros & Diaconos ; sed Ecclesiæ totius suffragia & consensum adhibuisse, *Magd. Hist. Cent. i. Lib. ii. c. 6.*

(b) *Du Pin's Eccles. Hist. Abridgment of Discipline of the three first Ages.*

(c) *Du Pin's Abridgment of the Discipline in the 4th Century.*

' cil, even in 550, make the Ordination of a Bishop to
 ' be void, where he is not elected by the People. And
 ' Father Paul saith, *That Pope Leo shews amply that the*
 ' *Ordination of a Bishop could not be lawful or valid, which*
 ' *was not required or sought for by the People, and by them*
 ' *approved of; which is said by all the Saints of those Times:*
 ' *and St. Gregory thought Constance could not be consecra-*
 ' *ted Bishop of Milan, being elected by the Clergy, without*
 ' *the Consent of the Citizens, who by reason of Persecution*
 ' *retired to Genoa; and he prevailed that they should be*
 ' *first sent unto, to know their Will: a thing worthy to be*
 ' *noted in our Days, when that Election is declared to be ille-*
 ' *gitimate and null, in which the People have any share.*
 ' *Thus things are chang'd and pass'd into a quite contrary*
 ' *Custom, calling that lawful, which then was accounted wic-*
 ' *ked, and that unjust, which then was reputed holy. This,*
 ' *I think, makes it plain, that the Bishops themselves*
 ' *did not for several Centuries imagine, that the Right*
 ' *of making Bishops was appropriated by God to them,*
 ' *when we see, that they thought all they did in this*
 ' *matter was null, except where there was a previous*
 ' *Election of the People; which if the ordaining (ta-*
 ' *king that word for constituting or appointing) Bishops*
 ' *had by Divine Right belonged only to that Order,*
 ' *would be so far from being necessary, that it would*
 ' *be a Sacrilege in the People to meddle with it (a).'*

Perhaps this Author mayn't please Mr. H. and there-
 fore he may slight his Authorities. I will therefore give
 him the Testimony of an eminent Writer of the esta-
 blish'd Church. The Learned Dr. Barrow, in his excel-
 lent Treatise of the *Pope's Supremacy*, has made a noble
 Collection of Testimonies for this Protestant Truth, for
 which I am contending. And because that Book is not
 in every hand, I will transcribe some few Paragraphs
 out of it, which immediately concern the Point I am
 upon. Says he, ' In antient Times, there was not any
 ' small Church, which had not a Suffrage in the choice
 ' of its Pastor; and was it fitting that all the Church
 ' should have one imposed on it without its consent?
 ' If we consider the Manner in antient Time of electing
 ' and constituting the Roman Bishop, we may thence

(a) *Rights of the Christian Church*, p. 359, 360. 4 Edit.

' discern not only the Improbability, but the Iniquity
 ' of this Pretence: How was he chosen? Was it by a
 ' general Synod of Bishops, or by Delegates from all
 ' parts of *Christendom*?—No; he was chosen, as usually
 ' then other Bishops were, by the Clergy and People
 ' of *Rome* (a).——Of old it was (as other Elections)
 ' managed by the Nomination of the Clergy, and Suffrage
 ' of the People (b). That the Designation of a
 ' Person to be Bishop did belong to the faithful People,
 ' the Learned Doctor clearly and fully shews, from the
 ' Survey of antient Rules and Practices concerning this
 ' Matter. Says he, ' The first Constitution after our
 ' Lord's Decease of an Ecclesiastick Person, was that of
 ' *Matthias* into the vacant Apostolate, or *Bishoprick* of
 ' *Judas*; wherein (upon St. *Peter's* Motion) all the Dis-
 ' ciples present did by consent *present two, out of whom*
 ' *God himself did elect one*, by determining the Lot to fall
 ' on *Matthias*: so that this Designation being partly hu-
 ' man, and partly divine; so far as it is human, it went
 ' by the *free Election of the whole Fraternity*, [quite con-
 ' trary to Mr. H. on these words.] The next Constitution
 ' we meet with, is that of Deacons, wherein the Apo-
 ' stles did commit the Designation of the Persons to the
 ' *Multitude of Disciples*, who elected *them*, and presented
 ' them to the Apostles, who by Prayer and laying on
 ' of their Hands ordained them.——As to the Consti-
 ' tution of Bishops in the first Apostolical Times, the
 ' Course was this; the Apostles and Apostolical Persons
 ' (who were authorized by the Apostles to act with
 ' Power, and in their stead) did in the Churches foun-
 ' ded by them, constitute Bishops, such as by Divine
 ' Inspiration, or their Grace of Discretion did guide
 ' them to.——This was not done without the Consent of
 ' the Christian People, as *Clemens Romanus* telleth us in
 ' his excellent *Epistle* to the *Corinthians*.——In the next
 ' Times, says he, when those extraordinary Persons and
 ' Faculties had expired,——upon a Vacancy the Clergy
 ' and People of each Church did elect its Bishop; in
 ' which Action commonly the Clergy did propound and
 ' recommend a Person or Persons, and the People by

(a) *Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy*, p. 612.

(b) P. 614.

' their Consent approve, or by their Suffrages elect one,
 ' a strict Examination of Life and Doctrine intervening.
 ' ——— Afterward, when the Faith was diffused thro
 ' many Provinces, that Churches grew thick and close,
 ' the general Practice was this: The neighbouring Bi-
 ' shops (being advertised of a Vacancy, or want of a
 ' Bishop) did convene at the Place; then in the Con-
 ' gregation the Clergy did propound a Person, yielding
 ' their Attestation to his Fitness for the Charge: which
 ' the People hearing, did give their Suffrages, accept-
 ' ing him, if no weighty Cause was objected against
 ' him; or refusing him, if such Cause did appear (a).
 And for this the Doctor cites and translates part of the
 same *Epistle* from St. Cyprian, and part of the same
 Words which I cited in my Sermon (b). And he also
 adds some I mention'd not at that time, viz. ' *And when*
 ' (says he concerning himself) *a Bishop is substituted in*
 ' *the place of one deceased, when he is peaceably chosen by*
 ' *the Suffrage of all the People* (c). He adds moreover
 St. Cyprian's Testimony concerning Cornelius's Election,
 that ' *being in the Catholick Church, he was ordain'd by the*
 ' *Judgment of God, and by the Suffrages of the Clergy and*
 ' *People* (d). The Doctor farther cites the *Canons* of se-
 veral Councils, and acquaints us with what is worthy of
 Mr. H's notice in particular; because it seems to be
 what he has taken no notice of, and one cause of his
 Mistakes. ' In this Canon, says he, (the which is fol-
 ' low'd by divers Canons of other Synods) there is no
 ' express Mention concerning the Interest of the Clergy
 ' and People in the *Election* of the Bishops; but these
 ' things are only passed over, as precedaneous to the
 ' Constitution or Ordination, about which only the Fa-
 ' thers did intend to prescribe; supposing the *Election*
 ' to precede according to *former usual Practice*. That we
 ' ought thus to interpret the Canon, so that the Fathers
 ' did not intend to *exclude the People from their Choice*,

(a) P. 702, 703, 704.

(b) Ep. LXVIII. Pamel. LXVII. Oxon.

(c) Cæterum quando Episcopus in locum defuncti substi-
 tuitur, quando in pace deligitur Populi universi Suffragio,
 Ep. LV. Pamel. LIX. Oxon.

(d) Cornelio in Catholica Ecclesia de Dei Iudicio, &
 Cleri, & Plebis Suffragio ordinato, Ep. LXVII. Pamel.

‘ doth appear from their *Synodical Epistle*, wherein they
 ‘ decree concerning Bishops constituted by *Meletius*, &c.’
 To this he adds, as a farther Confirmation of our Truth
 contrary to Mr. H. ‘ *Indeed the Practice generally doth con-*
 ‘ *firm this, the People every where continuing to elect their*
 ‘ *Bishops.* So did the People of *Alexandria* demand *A-*
 ‘ *thanasius* for their Bishop, &c.’ (a)

I will add to this one unexceptionable Evidence more
 for this Truth, that is, that Glorious Martyr, Archbishop
 ‘ *Cranmer*, who acquaints us, ‘ That sometimes the Apo-
 ‘ stles and others, unto whom God had abundantly gi-
 ‘ ven of his Spirit, sent or appointed Ministers of God’s
 ‘ Word; sometimes the People did *chuse* whom they
 ‘ *thought meet thereto.* And when any were sent or ap-
 ‘ pointed by the Apostles or others, the People of their
 ‘ own voluntary Will with Thanks did accept them :
 ‘ not for the *Supremity, Impery, or Dominion* that the A-
 ‘ *postles* had over them, to command as their Princes or
 ‘ *Masters* : but as good People, ready to obey the *Advice*
 ‘ *of good Counsellors*, and to accept any thing that was ne-
 ‘ cessary for their Edification and Benefit. The Bishops
 ‘ and Priests were at one time, and *were not two things*,
 ‘ but *both one Office* in the beginning of Christ’s Reli-
 ‘ gion—And the People, before Christian Princes were,
 ‘ did *commonly elect their Bishops and Priests.* In the New
 ‘ Testament, he that is appointed to be a Bishop or a
 ‘ Priest, needeth no *Consecration* by the Scripture; for
 ‘ *Election*, or appointing thereto, is sufficient (b).’

Thus clear does this Truth stand in Antiquity, that
 one would wonder how Mr. H. could not see what
 stares every body else in the face. What an unaccount-
 able thing is Prejudice, that it blinds Mens Eyes to that
 degree, as not to permit them to see Truths written
 as it were with a Sun-beam! That what these Wit-
 nesses testify is in fact Truth, we have a Multitude of
 Instances at hand to confirm; of which, to please Mr.
 H. and to gratify his Reader, we will set down a few.

Besides *Fabian* and *Cornelius*, chosen at *Rome*, and *Cy-*
prian at *Carthage*, by the Suffrage of the People; whom
 we have before taken notice of: we find that at *An-*

(a) P. 705.

(b) *Bishop Stillingfleet's Irenicum*, p. 392. Edit. 2.

Antioch the People did chuse Eusebius ; and upon the Emperor's Remonstrance to them, that their Choice was irregular, and contrary to the Canons of the Council at Nice, and the Constitutions of the Apostles, they chose another (a).

Ambrose was chosen by the People at Milan (b), according to Socrates ; and Flavianus by the People of Antioch, when Evagrius gave him disturbance, being his Competitor (c).

According to Valesius, Synesius was chosen by the People of Ptolemais (d). This same Synesius, in his Letter to Theophilus, Bishop of Alexandria, gives us a remarkable Instance of the Incroachment of the Clergy on the Rights of the People to chuse their own Ministers ; and the Zeal of a poor little People, in withstanding their Impositions : of which, for the Benefit of Mr. H's Reader, I will transcribe a part. ' The Inhabitants of Palebiscus and Hidrax, two Villages in Pentapolis near Libya, caused a young Man, Syderius by Name, to be ordained their Bishop, without observing the Formalities required in a legal Ordination. After his Death they own'd one Paul of Erythra for their Bishop. But Theophilus Bishop of Alexandria, who pretended to a Superintendency of them, would impose another Man upon them, and sends to this Synesius to go to those Villages, and ordain him. When he came to the Village, he found the honest People resolved to have no other Bishop than Paul ; and by all his Endeavours, he could never bring them to consent that he should ordain another Bishop for them. Synesius gives this Account to Theophilus, and at the same time insinuates that they would obey, if he would absolutely impose one upon them ; yet he thought it not convenient.' This Story the Reader may find at large in Du Pin's History of the Life of Synesius (e).

(a) Constantine's Epistles to the Church of Antioch, and to the Bishops there.

(b) Socrat. lib. iv. c. 30.

(c) Idem, lib. v. c. 15.

(d) Synesium tunc cum Ptolemaidenfibus electus est Episcopus, Not. Vales. in lib. I. c. 15. Evag. Hist.

(e) Du Pin's History, Cent. v.

If we may give credit to *Socrates*, after the Death of *Atticus*, Bishop of *Constantinople*, there was a great Contest about the Choice of a Bishop; some desiring one, and some another: At last *Sisinnius* was chosen by the Majority of the People (a). He also acquaints us, that when the Bishop of *Cyzicum* was dead, *Sisinnius*, Bishop of *Constantinople*, ordained *Proclus*, and sent him to be their Bishop. But when he was preparing to go, or on his Journey thither, the People of *Cyzicum* prevented him, and chose one for themselves, one *Dalmatius* by Name, whom they constituted their Bishop. And this they did, *Socrates* says, in contempt of an Ecclesiastical Order, that no Ordination should be made contrary to the Mind of the Bishop of *Constantinople* (b).

I might mention *Alexander*, *Athanasius*, *Nestarius*, *Chrysostom*, and many *Popes*; but I will close this Head with the Acknowledgment of a learned Man, who Mr. H. must own, was not prejudiced on my side of the Question; but spake the Truth, tho it was against himself, as being a *Papist*. It runs thus: 'We deny not the 'antient Custom of Election of Bishops, by which they 'were wont to be chosen, the People being present, 'yea, by the *Suffrages* of the People. For it is certain that this Custom was observed in *Africa* in the 'Election of *Eradius*, Successor to *Augustine*, concerning 'which his 120th Epistle yet remains. In *Greece*, in 'Chrysostom's time, 'tis plain from his third Book of the 'Priesthood. In *Spain* 'tis manifest from this place of 'Cyprian, and *Isidore's* Book of Offices. Among the 'French 'tis clear from the Epistle of Pope *Celestine* 'II. of Rome, and from what we have said above upon 'the Epistle to *Antonianus*; and elsewhere out of the 'Epistle of *Leo*: and this Custom continued to the time 'of *Gregory* the first, as appears from his Epistles; yea, 'this Custom remained even to the times of the *Emperors*, *Charles* and *Ludovic*; and this sufficiently appears 'from their first Book of Constitutions (c).'

This

(a) Κοινῇ δὲ πᾶσι ὁ λαὸς ἐπόθει γίνεσθαι Σισίννιον, πέθον δ' εἶχον τὸ ἀνδρὲς πάντες οἱ λαϊκοί, *Socrat. Hist. lib. vii. c. 26.*

(b) Φθάνασιν οἱ Κυζικηνικοί, καὶ χειροτονῶσιν ἄνδρα ἀσκητικόν, ὃ ὄνομα ἦν Δαλμάτιος, *Lib. vii. c. 28.*

(c) Non negamus veterem Electionis Episcoporum ritum, quo plebe præsente, immo Suffragiis Plebis eligi solent.

Nam

This full Confession from the Mouth of an Adversary shall save me and the Reader further trouble on this head. I hope Mr. H. will not now complain that my Instances are too few; or suggest, that I have in my Zeal staked my Honesty and Understanding for nothing. Having thus made good my word against Mr. H's base and unworthy Suggestion, I am now at leisure to attend to what he has advanced in opposition to what I had said.

And first Mr. H. says: Clement, in his former Epistle to the Corinthians, tells us, that the Apostles made the First-Fruit of their Labours Bishops and Ministers of those who should believe. Where was, where could the Appointment of the People be at that time? p. 27. Where was, where could be the undeniable Choice of ordinary Officers; where could the Appointment of Deacons be at that time? Let Mr. H. consider again the sixth Chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, and he will to his Conviction see where the Choice of the People could be at that time. But in the producing of this Testimony, Mr. H. has curtailed and spoiled honest Clement's Testimony. To have been fair, he should have set before his Reader the full Evidence, and not have smother'd any part of it; and then he would have been able to judge on which side of the Question Clement was. That the Reader may the better judge, we will set before him Clement's own Words: 'The Apostles preaching thro' Countries and Cities, constituted the First-Fruits of their Ministry for Bishops and Deacons of those who should afterwards believe, [thus far Mr. H.] having by the Spirit proved them (a).' And after he has shown how the

Nam in Africa illum observatum constat ex electione Eradii Successoris D. Augustini, de quo extat Epistola ejus 120. In Græcia ætate Chrysost. ex lib. 3. de Sacerd. In Hispaniis ex hoc Cypriani loco, & Isidor. lib. de Officiis. In Gallicis ex Epist. Celestin. Pap. 2. Romæ, ex iis quæ supra diximus Epist. ad Anton. Ubique etiam alibi ex Epist. Leonis 87. & perdurasse eam consuetudinem ad Gregor. 1. usque ex ejus Epistolis, immo & ad tempora usque Caroli & Ludovici Imperatorum ex lib. 1. capitulorum eorundem satis constat, *Pamelius in Cypr. Epist. LXVIII. ad Cler. & Pleb. in Hispania consistentes de Basilide & Martiale.*

(a) Κατὰ χώρας ἐν τῇ πόλει κηρύσσοντες, καθίσανον τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῷ δοκιμάσαντες τῷ πνεύματι εἰς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους ἢ μέλλόντων πιστεύειν, p. 54, 55.

Tribe of *Levi* was chosen to the Priesthood by the Budding of *Aaron's Rod*, and what Confusion and Sedition was thereby prevented among the People, he adds : ' Also our Apostles knew by the Lord Jesus Christ, that ' a Contention would arise, upon the account (or about ' the Name) of Episcopacy ; and for this cause, being ' endued with certain Foreknowledge, constituted the ' aforesaid Persons, and after they were dead, order'd ' other Men approved should succeed in their places, and ' execute their Offices. Those therefore who were constituted by them, or afterwards by other famous Men, ' with the consent of the whole Church, without Injustice ought not to be deposed, seeing they have ' served the Flock unblameably,' &c. (a) So that those who were constituted in *Clement's* time, were constituted with the *Consent*, or by the Good Will of the whole Church. Either Mr. H. had read this Epistle of *Clement*, or he had not. If he had read it, let the Reader judge of his Honesty, in not giving the whole of his Testimony : if he had not read it, then his Wisdom will appear equal to his Honesty, in taking upon trust what he should have examin'd well before he had impos'd it upon his Readers, and call'd out, *Where was, where could be the Appointment of the People at that time?* When 'tis plain they were constituted by the *Consent of the whole People*, tho the Apostles and Apostolick Men were by the Spirit directed to the Men.

The next thing Mr. H. produces against the People's Right to chuse their Ministers, is, that *St. Cyprian founds the Church upon the Bishops*, *Epist. XXXIII. Oxon.* Sure Mr. H. must entertain a very mean Opinion of his Reader's Understanding, that he could persuade himself to believe such a Reason as this would pass with him. *St. Cyprian founds the Church upon the Bishops ; ergo, the People have no Right to chuse their Ministers.* I

(a) Καὶ οἱ Ἀπόστολοι ἡμῶν ἔγνωσαν διὰ τῆς Κυρίας ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅτι ἔστιν ὅτι τῆς ὀνόματος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς διὰ ταύτην ἐν αἰσίαν προέγνωσιν εἰληφότες τελείαν, κατέστησαν τὰς περιεργασμένους, καὶ μετὰ ἐπιτομὴν δεδώκασιν, ὅπως ἐὰν κοιμηθῶσιν, διαδέξωνται ἕτεροι δεδοκιμασμένοι ἄνδρες, τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτῶν. τὰς ἐν καταστάθηντας ὑπὲρ ἐκείνων, ἢ μετὰ ὑφ' ἑτέρων ἐλλογίμων ἀνδρῶν, συνευδοκησάσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας πάσης, &c. p. 57.

presume the Reader sees how roundly the Consequence follows from the Premises. I shall therefore proceed to consider the next, which is of the same Stamp, and coin'd in the same Mint.

It runs thus: *The College of Presbyters and Deacons at Rome tell this Holy Father, that 'twas his Modesty that he did not, or would not govern alone, Epist. XXX. Oxon.* Well; and what then? What if they did thus tell him? *Ergo*, The Churches have no Right to chuse their own Ministers. This I confess is learned indeed!

To the same purpose, says he, *the Council of Carthage, Suffrag. LXXIX. p. 242. Oxon. (a)* In this Council the Confessor *Clarus* of *Mascula* says, 'The Mind of the Lord Jesus Christ sending his Apostles, and granting to them alone the Power given him of his Father, is manifest; whom we succeed governing the Church of the Lord with the same power, and baptizing the faithful. And therefore the Hereticks, who have no Power without; nor Church of Christ, can baptize no Man with Christ's Baptism.' From this *Suffrage* it appears, that *Hereticks* and *Schismatics* in general, and the *Novatian Hereticks* and *Schismatics* in particular, had not the Baptism of Christ, and therefore those were to be rebaptized, who were baptized by them; so that what Mr. H. here pretends to as for his Cause, effectually destroys it. For if *Novatian's Baptism*, according to St. Cyprian, and the *Suffrages* of this Council, was invalid, of consequence all his Orders; which will make such a dreadful Chasm in the Line, as never to be stopt up again. How contrary to Mr. H's Cause this Instance is, we have shown above, p. 6.

To cite, says Mr. H. *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Ignatius*, and the *Multitude of Passages* which St. Cyprian affords, would be tedious. I conclude the Reader will think, that if Mr. H. could have found any thing in any one of

(a) *Manifesta est sententia Domini nostri Jesu Christi, Apostolos suos mittentis, & ipsis solis potestatem a patre sibi datam permittentis, quibus nos successimus, eadem potestate Domini gubernantes, & credentium fidem Baptizantes.* [Thus far Mr. H. thought fit to go.] Et ideo Hæretici, qui nec potestatem foris, nec Ecclesiam Christi habent, neminem baptizare Baptismo ejus possunt.

these Authors for his purpose, we should have had it, and that set off to the greatest Advantage; for Mr. H. is not wont to pass over such creditable Witnesses, and be so very frugal of his Testimonies, if they had any thing to say for his Cause. Seeing he was so hard put to it, that he permitted those simple, impertinent, Witnesses to speak just before; we cannot rationally think that he would suffer these honourable hoary headed Evidences to keep silence, if they had any thing of moment to say for his purpose. *If this is not shewing a Zeal for something, and staking his Honesty and his Understanding,* let Mr. H. clear himself in his next. We expect to hear what *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, and *Ignatius*, have to say against the People's Right to chuse their own Ministers. Mr. H's pretended Brevity, in suggesting and not producing their Testimonies, will not be taken upon trust. *It is in vain,* says he, *to argue with that Man, who has no more Sense or Modesty than to pretend St. Cyprian's Authority against Episcopal Power and Right.* And who is that Man? not I; I have, it seems, more Sense and Modesty than so to do. I don't pretend his Authority against *Episcopal Power and Right*; but against *Episcopal Usurpation of the People's Right.* *St. Cyprian*, good Man! had more Modesty, according to the *Usurping Clergy's* Opinion at *Rome*, than to encroach on his Church's Right. He knew that it was not lawful for him, without the consent of his Clergy and People, to rule alone. Tho his People, or at least some of them, might be jealous of him, that he would follow the bad Example of those Times, and usurp such a Power; he shew'd them that he had not only more Modesty, but more Conscience than to do so, seeing he had obliged himself to the contrary from *the beginning of his Episcopacy.* He was resolved, like a good Bishop, to act according to Apostolick Rule, and Ecclesiastick Tradition.

Says Mr. H. *Our Author might have found Facts contrary to those produced by him.* I answer, I might have found Facts committed by the *Usurping Clergy* contrary to the Right of the Churches, I readily acknowledge; but what signifies Facts contrary to Right? However, Mr. H. is so very charitable as to lend us his Help in this case, and to produce some Facts, which, I suppose, he means, contrary to what I had produced. But no Man could be more unfortunate in his choice than Mr. H. is

in those Facts produced by him for his Cause. For either they have nothing in them for his purpose, or are diametrically opposite thereto; which his Reader will, upon an impartial Examination, be quickly convinced of.

First, says he, *Clement constituted Evaristus* [*Evaristus* he means] *without the People*. How Mr. H. could write this without blushing, I know not; for *Eusebius*, in the place referred to, says no such thing. That the Reader may see how egregiously he is imposed on by him in this Fact produced, I will transcribe *Eusebius's* own Words. Says he, '*Clement*, one of the Roman Bishops, 'the third Year of the aforesaid Emperor, died, leaving 'his Ministry (or *Bishoprick* if you please) to *Evaristus*, 'when he had exercised the Ministry of the Divine 'Word full nine Years (a).' Here we have an Account that *Clement* died, and left his Bishoprick to his Successor *Evaristus*; but not one word that he *constituted him without the People*. *Clement* died, and left his Bishoprick to *Evaristus*; ergo, he constituted him without the People. Just the same as if one should say, Mr. H's Predecessor died, and left his Parsonage to Mr. H. ergo, Mr. H. was constituted Rector of *Sutton* without the Consent of his Patron.

Mr. H. says further, that *Phadimus* appointed *Gregory* Bishop of *Neocæsarea*. Here he has forgot to tell his Reader where he had this Story; he is so far from telling us *what Edition*, that he has not been so kind as to tell him his Author. Let Mr. H. now call to mind that Saying of the Moralist :

Turpe est doctori, cum culpa redarguit ipsum.

But tho Mr. H. was not so obliging, *Du Pin* is so kind as to help us where Mr. H. fails. He tells us (b), that *Gregory Thaumaturgus* was ordained, contrary to his Inclination, Bishop of *Neocæsarea*, by *Phadimus* Bishop of *Amasea*; but not one word that he was appointed with-

(a) Τῶν δ' ὅτι Ρώμης ἐπισκόπων ἔτι τρίτῳ τῷ προειρημένῳ βασιλέως ἀρχῇ, Κλήμης Ἐυαρίστῳ παραδὼς τὴν λειτουργίαν ἀναλύει τὸν βίον, τὰ πάντα προσὰς ἔτη ἐννέα τῷ θεῷ λόγῳ διδασκαλίας, *Euseb. Hist. lib. iii. c. 34.*

(b) *Eccles. Hist. in the Life of Gregory Thaumaturgus.*

out the *Consent of the People*. 'Tis strange therefore Mr. H. should not distinguish between a Bishop's Consecration and his Election. *Phedimus consecrated Gregory; ergo, be appointed him without the People*. This is a sort of Logick Mr. H. has more than once fallen into.

But let us pass on to his third Instance, in which he says; *The thirty sixth Apostolical Canon says, The People are grossly wicked, who shall refuse a Minister ordained for them*. If this was true, it was but little to Mr. H's purpose; for when any People have gone so far as to approve and elect a Minister, if, after he is ordained by their Consent and Desire, with Fasting, and Prayer, and Imposition of Hands; unless somewhat considerable of Unworthiness appear in him, which lay concealed before, they must be *grossly wicked indeed*, who shall refuse such a Man ordained for them. But Mr. H's *thirty sixth Canon* has nothing like what he affirms to be in it. How Mr. H. will account with his Reader for this, I know not, I will leave it with him to consider that point. *Canon the thirty sixth* runs thus; 'A Bishop must not venture to ordain out of his own Bounds, for Cities and Countries which are not subject to him. But if he be convicted of having so done, without the Consent of those who govern those Cities and Countries, let him be deprived, both he and those whom he hath ordained.' What there is in this *Canon* against the People's Right to chuse their own Ministers, I see not; if Mr. H's Reader can see any thing for his purpose in it, I readily acknowledge he has a sharper sight than I.

Next our learned Considerer says, that the *famous Church of Alexandria is a pregnant Instance of constituting Ministers without the People*. Was ever Man so unfortunate! Sure Mr. H. must needs chuse blindfold, he could never else have hit upon an Instance so directly opposite to his purpose. Had I chose any Instance for my Cause, I could hardly have fixed on any one more pertinent for me. The Truth hereof will presently appear to the impartial Reader. Mr. *Du Pin* acquaints us, 'That the famous *Athanasius*, who so stiffly opposed the *Arians* in *Constantine's* Days, was chosen Bishop of the Church of *Alexandria* in the beginning of the Year 326, by the common Voice of all the People, and was ordained by the Bishops of *Egypt, Libya, and Pentapo-*

(a)
of Al
(b)
(c)
(d)
Popu
vim
non

'*lis*; and this is the Testimony those Bishops give of his Ordination in a Synodical Letter reported by St. *Athanasius*, *Apol. 2. p. 726.*' (a) This is a *pregnant Instance* indeed! How bright does the People's Right shine here! The same Author tells us, that *Achillas* was chosen Bishop of the same Church of *Alexandria* (b). And this was the constant Practice of the Church, till by some Disorders committed by the *Arian* Faction, the Emperor by violence wrested this Privilege out of their hands. This is abundantly manifest not only by what *Du Pin* says, as from *Athanasius*, summing up the Acts of Discipline in his days, at the end of his History of *Athanasius's* Works, That at *Alexandria*, and elsewhere, yea, that 'twas the general Practice that the People and Clergy did chuse Bishops, and other Bishops did ordain them; but from what *Evagrius* says of the *Petition* which the *Alexandrians* presented to the Emperor *Zeno*, by *Johann.* a Presbyter, that if it happen'd that their Bishop should die, they might enjoy their old Privilege, to chuse for their Bishop whom they had most respect for (c), *Valesius*, in his Notes on this Petition of theirs, says, "'Tis apparent from this place, that the Power of electing their Bishops had been taken from the Clergy and People of *Alexandria*, which we deny not was done by Force, and against the Ecclesiastical Laws (d).'

If nothing else was to be said, the frequent Tumults, which the Ambition of the several Candidates did cause at Elections of Bishops, and the sad Disasters which happen'd at some, if all History is not fabulous, is sufficient to prove that popular Elections were common in the Primitive Days. Not to say any thing of the Tumults at *Antioch*, and *Rome*, and other Places, at the Elections of their Bishops; the sad Confusion and Disorder at *Alexandria*, at the Ordination of *Timotheus* Æ-

(a) *Eccles. Hist. in the Life of St. Athanasius, and in the Life of Alexander, Cent. iv.*

(b) See also *Socrat. Hist. lib. iii. c. 7.*

(c) *Evagr. Eccles. Hist. lib. iii. c. 12.*

(d) *Electio igitur Episcoporum adempta fuerat Clero ac Populo urbis Alexandriae, ex hoc loco apparet. Quod per vim quidem & contra Leges Ecclesiasticas factum fuisse non diffitemur.*

lurus, when *Proterius* was murder'd, puts it beyond Dispute how pregnant an Instance this Church was of constituting Ministers without the People. But to confirm Mr. H's Reader in the Belief of this Truth, I will produce the Authority of one whom Mr. H. has a great Veneration for, and who, he must own, knew more of these Matters than himself. Bishop *Pearson* is the Man I mean, who says on these words of *Hierom*; *Presbyteri ex se electum in excelsiore gradu collocatum Episcopum nominabant*: '(a) Whether this was done by Right or Wrong, *Hierom* tells us not; yea, that they did any thing besides nominating a Bishop, he does not say. Indeed *Selden* would have it, that from these words of *Jerom* may be gather'd, that the Patriarch was chosen and ordain'd by the Presbyters, when *Jerom* said neither. He indeed said, that the Bishop was chosen out of the Presbyters, but not by them; and he might be chosen out of them by others, either by the People, or by other Bishops: and truly the Bishops of *Alexandria*, from the most antient Times, seem to be chosen by the People. And that with good Reason may be gather'd from that antient Custom observed by *Epiphanius*, whose words are these: *Hæres. LXIX.* But the Custom at *Alexandria* is, that after the Death of a Bishop a Successor is not long deferred, but presently, for the sake of Peace, one is substituted, lest Brawles and Contentions should

(a) Quo jure quave injuria hoc factum sit Hieronymus non dicit, imo quid aliud fecerint, quam quod Episcopum nominarint, non docet. Vult quidem Seldenus ex verbis Hieronymi colligi debere, Patriarcham a Presbyteris electum & ordinatum fuisse, cum Hieron. neutrum doceat. Dicit quidem Episcopum ex Presbyteris electum, a Presbyteris non dicit; potuit autem ex Presbyteris ab aliis eligi, vel a Populo, vel ab Episcopis aliis; & sane videntur ab antiquissimis temporibus a Populo eligi *Alexandriae* Episcopi, idque ex antiqua consuetudine ab *Epiphanio* observata colligi meliore jure potest, cujus hæc verba sunt, *Hæres. LXIX.* Ἔθος δὲ ἐν Ἀλεξανδρίᾳ μὴ χερνίζεν μετὰ τελευτῇ ἐπισκόπου τὸς κατισταμένους, ἀλλ' ἅμα γενέσθαι εἰρήνης ἐνεκα, τὸ μὴ παραβριθᾶς γενέσθαι ἐν τοῖς λαοῖς, ὥς μὲν τὸνδε θιλόντων, τὸνδε τὸνδε: *Alexandriae* autem consuetudo est, ut post Episcopi mortem Successor non diutius differatur, sed subinde pacis tuenda gratia

' should arise among the People, some requiring one, and
 ' some another. And this Custom supposeth the People
 ' at Alexandria, as well as in other Churches, in antient
 ' time to have their share in chusing their Bishop. It
 ' is certain that the Eusebians, who endeavour'd to an-
 ' nul Athanasius's Creation, objected, that he was not
 ' chosen by the People; and the Bishops of Egypt as-
 ' sembled in a Synod, writ an Epistle to all the Bishops
 ' of the Catholick Church, and in which they strenu-
 ' ously assert and maintain the contrary: That all the
 ' Multitude, and all the People of the Catholick Church be-
 ' ing gathered together in a Body, as with one Soul, with
 ' loud and earnest Cries required Athanasius to be their Bi-
 ' shop. Which thing neither these, nor those, would
 ' have done, if, of old time, the Suffrages of the Peo-
 ' ple had no place in the Choice of a Bishop. Yea,
 ' Gregory Nazianzen in his 21 Orat. opposeth this Elec-
 ' tion, not to former Elections, but to latter; and calls
 ' this an Apostolical Election. So therefore for these
 ' Causes he was, by the Suffrages of the whole People,
 ' and not according to the corrupt Example which af-
 ' terwards

gratia subrogetur, ne aliis hunc, aliis illum postulantibus, in populo
 jurgia & contentiones existerent. Hæc autem consuetudo sup-
 ponit Populum Alexandriæ, ut in aliis Ecclesiis, suas ali-
 quando Episcopo antiquitus partes habuisse. Certe Euse-
 biani, qui creationem S. Athanasii abrogare voluerunt, de-
 fectum Popularis Electionis objiciebant, & Episcopi Ægypti
 in Synodo congregati Epistola ad omnes Ecclesiæ Catholi-
 cæ Episcopos scripta contrarium magna animi contentione
 asseruerunt & testati sunt, ὅτι δὲ πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος καὶ πᾶς ὁ
 λαὸς τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας, ὡς περ ἐκ μιᾶς ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος συν-
 ελελεύδοτες ἀνέβησαν ἐκράζον αἰτῶντες Ἀθανάσιον ἐπισκοπὸν τῇ
 ἐκκλησίᾳ: Quod omnis multitudo omnisque Populus Catholica Ec-
 clesia, tanquam ex una anima, & corpore congregati, clamoribus vo-
 ciferationibusque postularent Athanasium Episcopum dari. Quod
 neque hi, neque illi fecissent, si Populi Suffragia in eligendo
 Episcopo, antiquitus locum nullum habuissent. Imo Gre-
 gorius Nazianzenus Orat. 21. hanc Electionem non priori-
 bus, sed posterioribus opponit, eamque Apostolicam appel-
 lat. εἶπω μὲν ἔν καὶ διὰ ταῦτα ψῆφω τὴν λαὸν παντὸς κατὰ τὸν
 ἕσπερον νικήσαντα πονερόν τύπον, εἰδὲ φονικῶς τε καὶ πυρρηνικῶς,
 ἀλλ' Ἀποστολικῶς τε καὶ πνευματικῶς ὅτι τὸν Μάρτυρα θεόνον ἀνά-
 γεται. Sic igitur atque ob eas causas totius Populi Suffragiis, non
 autem

‘terwards prevailed, nor by Violence and Slaughter ;
 ‘but by the Apostolick and Spiritual Manner advanced
 ‘to the Throne of St. Mark. Seeing therefore the
 ‘whole People did concern themselves at the Election
 ‘of a Bishop, the City being large, and abounding with
 ‘a great number of Christians ; and besides, the Pres-
 ‘byters there having their distinct Companies or Churches,
 ‘as Epiphanius observes, *Hæres. 69, &c.* and every one of
 ‘them having great Authority among their own People,
 ‘’twas thought necessary not to delay the Election of
 ‘a Bishop, lest a Delay should occasion Tumults and
 ‘Factions.’ Thus I have set before Mr. H’s Reader,
 and, I hope, to his Satisfaction, what a glorious and
pregnant Instance this Church of *Alexandria* is of chusing
 Bishops with the *Consent of the People*, diametrically op-
 posite to what Mr. H. produced it for.

We may charitably hope, that the Light of this
pregnant Instance so glared in Mr. H’s Face, that it ex-
 torted that innocent Confession from him which follows.
 Says he ; *I confess the People in latter Times were con-
 cerned in filling the vacant Sees.* The People in latter
 Times ! What Times does Mr. H. mean ? and what
 People ? If he mean the People in the Roman Com-
 munion, ’tis not true, for they have not been concern’d
 in filling the vacant Sees these several hundred Years.
 This Privilege has been wrested from them a long
 time, they have nothing to do in Elections of Bishops
 in these latter Times. If he means the People of the
 Protestant Churches, it is true of some of them, but
 not of all. But then what the Protestant People do in
 this case in latter Times, was the Privilege of the Chri-
 stian People from the Apostles Days. For in chusing
 their Ministers in these latter Times, the People only
 act correspondent with the Practice of the Churches in

*autem secundum prævum exemplum, quod postea inolevit, neque per
 vim ac cadem, sed apostolico & spiritali modo ad Marci Thronum
 evehitur. Cum igitur totius Populus electioni Episcopi se
 infereret, & præterea Presbyteri suos ibi distinctos cætus
 sive Ecclesias haberent, observante Epiphanio Hæres. 69. &c.
 ideoque apud Populum magnum quisque authoritatem ob-
 tineret, Electiones subito factas esse putandum est, ne mora
 tumultibus, factionibusque occasionem preberet, Vindicæ,
 par. i. cap. x. p. 164.*

the Primitive Days, as we have abundantly proved. Therefore what Mr. H. so boldly and confidently asserts in the next Lines, is a notorious Mistake ; not considering what St. Cyprian and his *African Council* had declared to the Clergy and People of *Spain*: viz. ‘ That the People chiefly had the Power of chusing worthy Bishops, and of refusing the unworthy ; and that they had this Power by Apostolical Authority and Divine Tradition.’

What Mr. H. says, p. 30. concerning the word *Suffragium*, is so learned, that 'tis pity it should pass without Observation. Nor does the word *Suffragium*, says he, signify any thing, unless by other Citations the Sense of it could be restrained, &c. The Sense of the word *Suffragium*, when used in Elections, is so firmly fix'd and restrain'd, that 'tis a wonder how the learned Rector could doubt about it. For however St. Cyprian might in other cases apply and use it in a more lax and unusual Signification, it does not follow, but that he used it in its common and fixed Sense, when he is speaking of *Elections*. Mr. H. would have the word *Suffragium* only to mean giving *Testimony*, or shewing a good Opinion of one, or at most according to *Pontius*, *Spirituali Desiderio concupiscere*. Both are included in its Sense ; but not the whole that *Suffragium* does mean. St. Cyprian, in relating the Election of *Cornelius*, uses this Word in contradistinction to *Testimony*, and therefore it must signify somewhat more than that. Says he, ‘ He was made Bishop by the *Testimony* of almost all the Clergy, and by the *Suffrage* of the People (a).’ And speaking to *Cornelius* of himself and his own Election, he says, ‘ Nobody after the *Divine Determination*, nobody after the *Suffrage of the People*, nobody after the *Consent of the other Bishops* (b).’ And after, he further says, ‘ When a Bishop is substituted in the room of one deceased, when he is peaceably chosen by the *Suffrage of all the People*.’ No Man, I suppose, besides

(a) De Clericorum pene omnium Testimonio, de Plebis Suffragio, *Epist. LV. Oxon. LII. Pamel.*

(b) Nemo post divinum Judicium, post Populi Suffragium, post Coepiscoporum Consensum—Quando Episcopus in locum defuncti substituitur, quando Populi universi Suffragio in pace deligitur, *Cyp. Epist. LV. Pamel. LIX. Oxon.*

Mr. H. can persuade himself to believe that St. Cyprian in these places meant no more than bare shewing a good Opinion, or giving Testimony of his Life. Those very Places singled out by Mr. H. if duly consider'd, I believe will be found to be contrary to his Purpose. The first is p. 223. where St. Cyprian speaking of David's having killed Goliath, the People breaking out into excessive Praises of him, and preferring him to Saul, shows plainly what the Sense of *Suffragium* is there. And Saul understood it right, that the People did prefer David to him; for, says he, *What can be have more but the Kingdom?* (a) And it is this Preference St. Cyprian means by those words: 'When the Enemy was slain, the People admiring, broke forth in the Praises of David by their *Suffrage of Applause* (b).' By which they declared, that David was in their Judgment to be prefer'd to Saul; and this to Saul was a Presage of their future *Suffrage*. That in pag. 16. is as plain as can be desired for what we assert. Where St. Cyprian is declaring how the Jews, inflamed with Anger and Rage against our Blessed Lord, because of his Wisdom and Doctrine, caught him, and falsely accused him, and having deliver'd him to Pontius Pilate, with earnest Clamours demanded his Crucifixion; which St. Cyprian expresses thus in the Place referred to in Mr. H's Margin: With *earnest and resolute Suffrage* they demand his Crucifixion and Death (c). Now if we look into Matt. xxvii. to which Mr. H. also refers us, and from whence St. Cyprian's Sense is to be understood, we shall soon be satisfy'd what St. Cyprian means by his *violentis ac pertinacibus Suffragiis*, in ver. 17. Pilate asked the Jews, *Whom shall I release to you, Barabbas or Jesus?* And the Elders persuaded the Multitude to ask Barabbas, and to destroy Jesus. Here they preferred, or chose Barabbas. Again, in ver. 21. the Governour asks them, *Whether of the twain will ye*

(a) 1 Sam. xviii. 8.

(b) Quia Golia interfecto, & ope ac dignatione divina tanta hoste deleto, Populus admirans in laudes David Prædicationis Suffragio profiliit; Saul simultatis atque insectationis furias de livore concepit.

(c) Crucem ejus & Mortem Suffragiis violentis ac pertinacibus flagitantes.

that I release unto you? They said Barabbas. Then Pilate saith to them, ver. 22. *What shall I then do with Jesus?* They all said, *Let him be crucify'd.* And the Governor said, in ver. 23. *Why, what Evil hath he done?* But they cry'd out the more [*violentis & pertinacibus Suffragiis*] *Let him be crucify'd.* And Mark says, *They cry'd out more exceedingly, Let him be crucify'd,* xv. 14. Luke is yet more full, and leaves us in this case without doubt what Cyprian means; telling us that they cry'd out all at once, saying, *Away with this Man, and release unto us Barabbas.* But Pilate, willing to release Jesus, spake again to them; but they cry'd, *Crucify him, crucify him:* and he said to them the third time, *Why, what Evil hath he done? I have found no cause of Death in him; I will therefore chastize him, and let him go.* And they were instant with loud Voices, requiring, or demanding, that he might be crucify'd; and the Voices of them, and of the Chief Priests, prevailed, xxiii. 18, &c. In this, one of Mr. H's own Instances, we have the full Sense of *Suffragium*. Here are two Persons propos'd, one of whom the Governor was willing, according to Custom, to release; they chose one, and manifested their Desire, and gave their Voices for Barabbas to be released, and that in a very violent and pertinacious Manner: they were resolved and resolute, no Reasoning would turn them from this their Purpose. I presume this may be sufficient to convince any impartial Reader, that what Mr. H. has said is mere Cavilling, wherein he misrepresents his Author, and the Scripture too, when he asserts, that what Cyprian intends by those words, *violentis & pertinacibus Suffragiis*, is by St. Matthew given in an humble Strain of a Petition; when 'tis plain by St. Matthew's words, compared with what is related of the same Story by the other Evangelists, especially by St. John, that it was so far from being an humble Petition, that it was a pertinacious Demand, with a taunting Suggestion, which carries a Threat in it: But the Jews cry'd out, saying, *If thou let this Man go, thou art not Cæsar's Friend: whosoever maketh himself a King, speaketh against Cæsar,* xix. 12. From the whole we may see, the word *Suffrage*, as used by St. Cyprian, is more than the bare Testimony of a Person's Life, or good Opinion, or Desire. It carries in it a Preference of one Thing or Person to another; a Choice, and full Consent of Will, yea, a Postulation or Demand.

Thus was St. *Cyprian* chosen by the *Suffrage* of his People; he had not only their *Testimony*, and good *Opinion*, but their *full Consent*, manifested by their *Voices*, or *stretching forth their Hands*, whereby Persons sometimes manifest Consent: and upon this *they earnestly desired*, as *Pontius* expresses it (a), that he would be their Bishop. And this was what *Cyprian* and his Collegues asserted, that the People had chiefly the Power to do, as in the case of *Martial* and *Basilides*, i. e. the People had the *chief Power of choosing and refusing* whom they pleased who were offer'd to them, and by *their Suffrage* to determine who should be their Bishop. For the Proof of this, I cited some part of *Cyprian's Synodical Epistle* to the Clergy and People of *Spain*, concerning *Martial* and *Basilides*, whom they had rejected for joining with Idolaters in the Times of Persecution. To this Mr. H. falsely suggests to his Reader, that I had not told where this Citation was to be found in St. *Cyprian*; when I had said it was to the Clergy and People of *Spain* concerning *Martial* and *Basilides*, whom they had deposed for communicating with Idolaters, &c. From which every Man, any thing acquainted with St. *Cyprian*, might easily have found it, tho the Number of the *Letter*, or the *Page*, was not mentioned. And Mr. H. having, it seems, at last found it, in LXVII. *Epist. Oxon.* because he could not gainsay it, or invalidate what is therein declared against him, does what he can to ridicule and expose it, because it was not transcribed *verbatim*, as it lay in St. *Cyprian*; when every Man of Sense, except Mr. H. might see by the Breaks in the Citation itself, in my Margin, that it was not so transcribed. But it is somewhat strange, that while Mr. H. is endeavouring to expose me, he should forget that he had done the same thing but two Pages before, in transcribing some Passages out of the same *Letter*, and that without obliging his *English* Reader with a Translation of those Passages. However, since Mr. H. has thought fit to fix this Charge upon me, for want of something to say which was more to his purpose, in order to supply both my own and his Defect, I will transcribe and translate *verbatim* what concerns us in that

(a) Spirituali Desiderio concupiscens.

Epistle; and I hope the Reader will not be displeased to hear St. *Cyprian* speak *Englisk*, for I am not afraid to hear him give his Testimony in a Language well understood by our Readers. It runs thus: '(a) We carefully and religiously weighing the Affair before us, in the Ordinations of Priests, ought to chuse no Bishops but those who are unspotted and sincere, who offering to God Sacrifices after an holy and worthy manner, may be heard in those Prayers which they put up for the Safety of the Lord's People: since it is written, *God heareth not a Sinner; but if any Man worship God, and do his Will, him God heareth.* For which cause, with perfect Diligence, and sincere Examination, those ought to be chosen to the Priesthood, whom it is certain God will hear. Let not the People flatter themselves, that they can be free from the Contagion, if they communicate with an infected Priest, and give their Consent to the unjust and unlawful Episcopacy of their Bishop, when by the Prophet *Hosea* the Divine Judgment is declared and threatned: *Their Sacrifices shall be as the Bread of Lamentation; all who eat thereof shall be defiled.* Teaching and shewing that all, doubtless, will be guilty of Sin, who shall be defiled with the Sacrifice of a profane and unjust Priest. Which thing likewise we find declared in *Numbers*,
when

(a) Quæ ante oculos habentes, & sollicitè ac religiose considerantes, in Ordinationibus Sacerdotum non nisi immaculatos & integros antistites eligere debemus, qui sancte & digne Sacrificia Deo offerentes, audire in precibus possint, quas faciunt pro Plebis Dominicæ incolumitate: cum scriptum sit, Deus peccatorem non audit; sed si quis Deum coluerit, & voluntatem ejus fecerit, illum audit. Propter quod plena diligentia, & exploratione sincera oportet eos ad Sacerdotium deligi, quos adeo constat audire. Nec sibi Plebs blandiatur quasi immunis esse a contagio delicti possit, cum Sacerdote peccatore communicans, & ad injustum atque illicitum Præpositi sui Episcopatum, Consensum suum commodans, quando per Osee Prophetam comminetur, & dicat Censura divina: Sacrificia eorum tanquam panis luctus; omnes qui manducant ea contaminabuntur. Docens scil. & ostendens, omnes omnino ad peccatum constringi, qui fuerint profani & injusti Sacerdotis Sacrificio contaminati. Quod item in Numeris manifestari invenimus, quando

' when *Chorab*, and *Dathan*, and *Abiram*, claimed the
 ' Privilege of sacrificing contrary to *Aaron* the Priest,
 ' There also the Lord commanded by *Moses*, that the
 ' People should be separated from them, lest being as-
 ' sociate with these vile Men in their Wickedness, they
 ' should also be punished with them: *Be ye*, says he,
 ' *separate from the Tabernacles of these stubborn Men, and*
 ' *touch not any thing that belongs to them, lest ye perish to-*
 ' *gether in their Sin.* For which reason the People, obe-
 ' dient to the Lord's Commands, and fearing God, ought
 ' to separate themselves from a wicked Bishop, and not
 ' mix themselves with the Worship of a sacrilegious
 ' Priest: seeing *they chiefly have the Power of choosing wor-*
 ' *thy Priests, and of refusing the unworthy.* Which very
 ' thing we have seen descend from Divine Authority,
 ' that a Priest is to be chosen, the People being pre-
 ' sent, and in the view of all, and that the worthy and
 ' able may be approved by publick Judgment and Te-
 ' stimony, as in *Numbers* the Lord commanded *Moses*,
 ' saying, *Take Aaron thy Brother, and Eleazar his Son,*
 ' *and set them upon the Mount, in the Presence of all the*
 ' *Congregation, and divest Aaron of his Robe, and clothe*
 ' *his Son Eleazar with it, and Aaron shall there die.* God
 ' commanded, that the Priest should be constituted in
 ' the

Chore, & Dathan, & Abiram contra Aaron Sacerdotem sa-
 crificandi sibi licentiam vindicaverunt. Illic quoque per
 Moysem præcepit Dominus, ut ab eis Populus separetur,
 ne facinorosis conjunctus eodem facinore & ipse perstrin-
 gatur: Separamini, inquit, a Tabernaculis hominum isto-
 rum durissimorum, & nolite tangere ea quæ ad eos perti-
 nent, ne simul pereatis in peccato eorum. Propter quod
 Plebs obsequens præceptis Dominicis, & Deum metuens, a
 peccatore præposito separare se debet, nec se ad sacrilegi
 Sacerdotis Sacrificia miscere; quando ipsa maxime habeat
 potestatem vel eligendi dignos Sacerdotes, vel indignos re-
 cusandi. Quod & ipsum videmus de Divina Autoritate
 descendere, ut Sacerdos Plebe præsentē, sub omnium ocu-
 lis deligatur, & dignus atque idoneus publico judicio ac
 testimonio comprobetur, sicut in Numeris Dominus Moyse
 præcepit, dicens, Apprehende Aaron fratrem tuum, & E-
 leazarum filium ejus, & impone eos in montem coram om-
 ni Synagoga, & exue Aaron stolam ejus, & indue Eleaza-
 rum filium ejus, & Aaron appositus moriatur illic. Coram
 omni Synagoga jubet Deus constitui Sacerdotem, id est,
 instruit

' the Presence of all the Congregation ; that is, he in-
 ' structs and shews us that Sacerdotal Ordinations ought
 ' not to be done, but with the knowledge of the *Peo-*
 ' *ple standing by, [or assisting]* that the Crimes of the
 ' Wicked may be discover'd, or the Deserts of the Good
 ' may be declared by the People present : and that
 ' Ordination is just and most legitimate, which is ex-
 ' amin'd by the Judgment and *Suffrage* of all. Which
 ' thing afterward, according to Divine Authority, was
 ' observed in the *Acts of the Apostles* ; when in the Or-
 ' dination of an Apostle, in the room of Judas, Peter
 ' spake to the People. Says the Historian, *Peter rose*
 ' *up in the midst of the Disciples, and there was a great*
 ' *Multitude together.* And we find, that the Apostles did
 ' not observe this Custom in the Ordination of *Priests*
 ' *and Bishops* only, but also in the Ordination of *Deacons*.
 ' Of which very Practice we have an account in their
 ' *Acts.* And the *twelve*, says he, *called together all the*
 ' *whole Multitude of Disciples, and said unto them.* This
 ' was therefore done when the whole People were thus
 ' diligently and carefully called together, lest any un-
 ' worthy Person should steal into the Priesthood and
 ' Ministry of the Altar. For sometimes unworthy Per-
 ' sons have been ordained, not according to the Will
 ' of God, but according to human Presumption ; and
 ' that

instruit & ostendit Ordinationes sacerdotales non nisi sub
 Populi assistentis conscientia fieri oportere, ut Plebe præ-
 sente vel detegantur malorum crimina, vel bonorum merita
 prædicentur, & sit ordinatio justa & legitima, quæ omnium
 Suffragio & Judicio fuerit examinata. Quod postea secun-
 dum Divina Magisteria observatur in Actis Apostolorum ;
 quando de ordinando in locum Judæ Apostolo, Petrus ad
 Plebem loquitur : Surrexit, inquit, Petrus in medio discen-
 tium, fuit autem turba in uno. Nec hoc in Episcoporum
 tantum & Sacerdotum, sed in Diaconorum Ordinationibus
 observasse Apostolos animadvertimus, de quo & ipso in
 Actis eorum scriptum est ; Et convocaverunt, inquit, illi
 duodecim totam Plebem Discipulorum, & dixerunt eis.
 Quod utique idcirca tam diligenter & caute convocata Ple-
 be tota gerebatur, ne quis ad altaris Ministerium, vel ad
 Sacerdotalem locum indignus obreperet. Ordinari enim
 nonnunquam indignos non secundum Dei voluntatem, sed
 secundum humanam præsumptionem, & hæc Deo displi-
 cere,

' that those things are displeasing to God, which come
 ' not from a just and lawful Ordination, God himself
 ' hath manifested by the Prophet *Hosea*, saying, *They have*
 ' *made themselves a King, but not by me.* For which reason
 ' it is diligently to be observed from Divine Tradition
 ' and Apostolical Observation, which is observed among
 ' us also, and thro almost all the Provinces, that for the
 ' due celebrating Ordinations, all the neighbouring Bi-
 ' shops of the same Province should come to the Peo-
 ' ple, for whom a Bishop is to be ordained, and the
 ' Bishop be chosen in the Presence of the People, who
 ' are fully acquainted with the Lives of each Person,
 ' and thoroughly know the Conduct of every one from
 ' his Conversation. Which thing, we see, was done by
 ' you in the Ordination of our Colleague *Sabinus*, that by
 ' the *Suffrage of the whole Fraternity*, and by the Judg-
 ' ment of the Bishops who were present, and who sent
 ' Letters to you concerning him, the Bishoprick was
 ' conferred on him, and he was ordained by Imposition
 ' of Hands in the room of *Basilides*. Nor may this
 ' compleat Ordination be made null.'

The Reader may now see with what reason Mr. H.
 calls my Citation *scandalous Work*; and says that *I am a*
very unfair or ignorant Writer. The Charge of Ignorance
 is a Compliment I have had from him before. But as
 to the Unfairness of the Citation, I appeal to the World

cere, quæ non veniant ex legitima & iusta Ordinatione,
 Deus ipse manifestat per Osee Prophetam, dicens; Sibimet-
 ipsis constituerunt Regem, & non per me. Propter quod
 diligenter de Traditione Divina, & Apostolica Observatione,
 servandum est & tenendum quod apud nos quoque, & fere
 per Provincias universas tenetur, ut ad Ordinationes rite
 celebrandas, ad eam Plebem, cui præpositus ordinatur, E-
 piscopi ejusdem Provinciæ proximi quique convenient, &
 Episcopus delegatur Plebe præsentē, quæ singulorum vitam
 plenissime novit, & uniuscujusque actum de ejus conversa-
 tione perspexit. Quod & apud vos factum videmus in Sa-
 bini Collegæ nostri Ordinatione, ut de universæ Fraterni-
 tatis Suffragio, & de Episcoporum qui in præsentia conve-
 nerant, quique de eo ad vos literas fecerant, Judicio; Epif-
 copatus ei deferretur, & manus ei in locum Basilidis impo-
 neretur. Nec rescindere Ordinationem jure perfectam po-
 rest.

for Justice, now the whole is transcribed, and his Citation and mine may be compared together. To have transcribed the whole into my Sermon, would, I believe, have been generally esteem'd a greater Instance of Folly in me, than this Observation is of his Wisdom and Knowledge. 'Tis obvious to every Reader, that after all this learned Examiner's Diligence in sifting this Citation, he is forced to own it to be St. *Cyprian's* and the Council's Declaration. This being too plain to be deny'd, he endeavours to impose upon his Reader's Credulity, by denying the Fact to be what I had said it was. I said, that *Martial* and *Basilides* had been censur'd by the Clergy and People of *Spain* for communicating with Idolaters. He says that they were censured, and *Felix* and *Sabinus* made their Successors by a Synod of Bishops. I cannot but observe here, that this learned Gentleman is not so honest and fair to his Reader, as to tell him where, and by what Synod, they were censured. 'Twill be kind, in his next, to acquaint us where to find the Council that deposed those Bishops, otherwise Mr. *H.* must excuse our Diffidence in this case. For till this is done, we must suspend our Belief of this bold Assertion. I desire the Reader impartially to compare what is said by us both, with St. *Cyprian's* and the Council's Declaration, and then let him judge who has the greatest appearance of Probability on his side. If a Synod of Bishops alone had censured and deposed these Men; what need, I beseech you, had this *African* Council to say, *Let not the People flatter themselves, that they can be free from the Contagion, if they communicate with an infected Priest, and give their Consent to the unjust and unlawful Episcopacy of their Bishop. For they have chiefly the Power of chusing worthy Priests, and of refusing the unworthy; which Power came down from Divine Authority.* Certainly such a Declaration as this had been as heterodox to the Clergy of *Spain*, and as foreign from their Design, as any thing could be, if what Mr. *H.* says is true. Again, if these Bishops had been deposed by a Synod alone, and not by the People, it looks a little too submissive, and indeed ridiculous, unbecoming a Synod of Bishops, to send to one single Bishop for Advice and Counsel, and that after the Fact committed, to subject their Synodical Censure to his Judgment and Determination. I am satisfy'd, that he who considers what

what weight Synodical Determinations had in those days, and how each Party strove to procure a Synod to confirm their Opinions or Practice, and how much superior their Decrees were to the Determination of a single Bishop, yea, tho he was the *Pope of Rome* himself ; will not find it easy to persuade himself to believe, that a Synod of *Spaniards* (not over humble by Nature) would submit their Synodical Determinations to the Judgment of one *African* Bishop ; much less would they humbly and submissively court his Opinion and Judgment on what they themselves had done. Let that Man believe this that can, for my part, it is still my Opinion, and I think most probable, that those Bishops were deposed by the Presbyters and People of their own Churches, and not by any Synod of Bishops of foreign Churches, and that when *Basilides* and *Martialis* appeal'd to *Stephen* at *Rome* ; to balance *Stephen's* Judgment, the Clergy and People appealed to *St. Cyprian*, a Man of equal, if not superior Fame and Authority in those days.

Mr. H. conscious of his Mistake in this, or jealous that it would not endure the Test, leaves the *Fact*, and says, *I mistake the Case. The Question is not concerning the constituting of Bishops, but the Reasons of Communion.* I say, the reason why the Clergy and People sent to *St. Cyprian*, was, to desire his Opinion, whether they had done well in deposing *Martialis* and *Basilides*, their Bishops ; and whether they had a Right to chuse *Felix* and *Sabinus* in their places. Now whether I, or Mr. H. mistake the Case, let the Reader judge by what Bishop *Cyprian* and his Colleagues sent in answer thereto. Their Answer was, that *they ought to separate themselves from a wicked Bishop, for they chiefly had the Power, and that by Divine Authority, to chuse worthy Priests, and to reject the unworthy.* If Mr. H. is not mistaken, then *Cyprian* and his Colleagues were egregiously out, in making this Reply to the Clergy and People of *Spain* ; for what had they to do to say, that they ought to separate from, and reject the unworthy, and that they chiefly had the Power to chuse worthy Bishops in their Places, if the Question was not about constituting Bishops, and in whose Power it was to constitute them ? Can any Man be so wilfully mistaken, or so very blind, as not to see that the Question was about the Legality of deposing their former Bishops, *Martial* and *Basilides*, and chusing
of

of *Felix* and *Sabinus* in their rooms? None but our Considerer, I hope. The Appeal of *Martial* and *Basilides* to *Stephen* was about the Injustice of their Deposition, and being still kept from their Bishopricks; and by their Insinuations they had prevailed with *Stephen* to espouse their Cause: but the Clergy and People applying themselves to *St. Cyprian*, he and his Council approved their Deposition of *Martial* and *Basilides*, and their Choice of *Felix* and *Sabinus* in their Places, and gave a very weighty Reason to back their Judgment; because *they chiefly had the Power to chuse the worthy, and to refuse the unworthy, and that by Divine Authority*. So that here *Mr. H.* has ventured to oppose his Opinion and Judgment to the Synodical Determination of those *Right Reverend Fathers* in Council, who understood the Case to be about the Constitution of Bishops, and not *Reasons of Communion only*.

In p. 32. our learned Considerer demands from us, 1. To prove that the People's Power *amounts to more than a Testimony*, &c. But to this I have said enough already; there is sufficient in *Father Cyprian's Potestatem eligendi dignos, & recusandi indignos*, to show that the People's Power in the Constitution of Ministers is more than bare Testimony of the Candidate's good Life; for a Catechumen had as much Power as that. That their *Testimony is absolutely necessary*, I know of none who affirm; but that the People give their Suffrage, or Consent, is according to Rule. For none is to be imposed on them against their Consent (a). And this is what we affirm; and I demand of *Mr. H.* to show, by the Law of Christ, that any Bishop should be imposed on a People without their previous Consent. As to that part of his Demand, *Whether Ministers are Tools of the People?* I answer, I never asserted any such thing, nor is it true; but that they are Servants of the Churches for Christ his sake, I, with the *Great Apostle*, affirm. To the last part we say, that a Bishop is as truly a Bishop *before, as after Consecration*, being chosen by the free Suffrages of the People and Clergy, or the whole faithful People. As a *King*, is as truly a *King* before *Coronation*, as after; as the present *French King* is as much,

(a) Nullis invitis detur Episcopus.

and as truly a *King*, and own'd by his Subjects as such, tho never yet *crown'd*. I again demand of our Considerer, that he prove by Reason or Scripture, that a Bishop elected by the Clergy and People, is not as truly a Bishop, as after Consecration; and that Consecration is absolutely necessary and essential to a Man's being a Bishop. Let Mr. H. prove this against what that Great Prelate and Martyr, Archbishop Cranmer, has asserted, *That in the New Testament he that is appointed to be a Bishop or Priest, needeth no Consecration by the Scripture; for Election, or appointing thereto, is sufficient (a)*. Let him not pretend to prove it by the Laws or Constitutions of this or that particular Church, or by telling us that they are not regularly Bishops; but let him be plain and honest, and prove it to be absolutely necessary and essential, without which, no Man can be a Bishop or Priest; let him prove it by Scripture, or, at least, by the dull Pretences of Reason: and when he has done this, *erit mihi magnus Apollo*.

But we go on to his next Demand. Says he, 2. *If this be too hard for him, I desire he will find me one Instance of an Ordination, Constitution, or Deposition of a Minister perform'd by the faithful People*. If Mr. H. means by Ordination and Constitution, the laying on of Hands, or properly the Rite of Consecration, then I say, I know nobody who asserts, that the faithful People did ordain, or so constitute Ministers. But if he means Election and Designation of the Persons *ad Officium*, then I say that the faithful People, *i. e.* the whole Church, did ordain and constitute Ministers, as is seen by the many Instances we have given above. As for Ordination and Deposition both, 'tis clear in that Instance of St. Cyprian about *Martialis* and *Basilides*, which one would think should satisfy the Curiosity of this Enquirer. But since it does not, I would refer him to St. Cyprian's Epistle to Stephen of Rome, where he will find that (b) St. Cyprian, tho a Man famed for *Episcopal Right and Authority*, exhorted Ste-

(a) Bishop Stillingfleet's *Irenicum*, part ii. chap. 7. p. 392.

(b) *Dirigantur in provinciam & ad plebem Arelatæ consistentema te literæ, quibus abfento Marciano alius in locum ejus substituatur; & grex Christi, qui in hodiernum ab illo dissipatus & vulneratus contemnitur, colligatur, Epist. LXVIII. Oxon. LXVII. Pamel.*

phen to send to the People of *Arles* in *France* to elect, that is, ordain and constitute a Bishop in the room of *Marcianus*. *Nestarius* also was chosen or constituted Bishop of *Constantinople* by the People in the Presence of 150 Bishops; and was ordain'd, at the same time, by some of those Bishops. This Story Mr. *H.* may find in *Socrates*, lib. v. cap. 8. (a) And in the same Author, if Mr. *H.* will please to look, he may find *John* Successor to this *Nestarius*, chosen by the Clergy and People, and ordain'd by the Emperor's Order. Where we have, as in the former Instance, Election and Ordination distinguish'd very clearly. (b) In a short time, says *Socrates*, 'after *Nestarius* his Death, there was a Contention about the Election of another Bishop, some being for one, some for another; and when they had often consulted about this Affair, it was at last agreed, that *John*, a Presbyter of the Church at *Antioch*, should be called: and after a little Interval, the Emperor *Arcadius*, with the common Suffrage of all, that is to say, both of Clergy and People, sent for him, and he was a little time after ordain'd.' Nothing was more common in the Churches than this very Practice, and nothing appears more clear in Ecclesiastical History than this, that Clergy and People, i. e. the Church, or faithful People, did in the Primitive Days elect their own Ministers, till the usurping Clergy broke in upon this their Right, and depriv'd them of it. But some Remains thereof appear'd till almost the darkest Times of Popery. For the *Roman Pontiffs* themselves were a long time thus chosen. It was in the time of *Leo VIII.* that this Right was deliver'd up to the Emperors, if we may give credit to *Platina* in this case: Who, he says, being weary of the Inconstancy of the *Romans*, transfer'd all Authority of chusing Bishops from the Clergy and People of *Rome* to the Emperor (c). And as the *Romans* did a long time

(a) Ὁς ἀρπαδεῖς ὑπὸ τῶ λαῷ, εἰς τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν περὶελήθην, καὶ τότε παρόντων ἑκατὸν πενήκοντα ἐπισκόπων χειροτονησάντων.

(b) Εὐθύς ἐν σπουδῇ περὶ χειροτονίας ἐπισκόπου ἐγένετο· καὶ ἄλλων ἄλλον ἐπιζητήσαντων, ὀλίγῃ ἐν διαδράσαντος χρόνῳ, Ἰωάννῃ μακρινῷ ὁμῶ πάντων, κλήρῳ τε σὺν καὶ λαῷ, ὁ βασιλεὺς αὐτὸν Ἀρκάδιος μεταπέμπεται, Socrat. lib. vi. cap. 2.

(c) Qui statim Romanorum inconstantiam pertæsus, auctoritatem omnem eligendi pontificis a clero populoque Romano ad Imperatorem transtulit, Plat. de vita Leonis octavi.

continue to elect, so they sometimes did exercise their Power to depose bad Bishops too ; for they deposed the same *Leo*, and *John* his Predecessor, as *Platina* also informs us (a). And Doctor *Barrow* tells us, that *Constantine* and *Anastasi* were also deposed by the *Roman People* (b). I hope these Instances of the *Roman People* will give our Demander ample Satisfaction.

Thus having shewn that the Power to elect and constitute their own Ministers, is by Christ and his Apostles committed to the *faithful People* ; I shall leave this Matter to the Reader's Judgment to determine for himself, as a good *Protestant* ought to do, and follow our Considerer in his farther Considerations, who now proceeds to decry Reason. Our Author, says he, *has insisted upon the dull Pretences of Reason, wherein that has nothing to do.* This Language might become a *Romish Priest* well enough ; but methinks 'tis pity a *Protestant Minister* should vend such *Romish Ware*. But in good earnest, must not Men use their Reason to judge of the Doctrine and Practice of their Spiritual Guides ? What have they their Bibles in their own Mother Tongue for, but to judge for themselves ? and can any judge for themselves, and not use their Reason ? Our learned Considerer in p. 10. says, *That Men are Judges for themselves in Spiritual Matters.* And if Men may judge for themselves in Spiritual Matters, I wonder in what Matters Reason has nothing to do. He who can once persuade Men to lay aside the Use of their Reason, and readily embrace any Doctrine upon his bare Word, without Examination, will go a great length in preparing them for any Principles, or any Religion. But in this inquisitive Age, I believe Men will hardly be persuaded to renounce their Reason in Matters of Religion, and suffer themselves to be impos'd upon. They are too well acquainted with Priestcraft, to discard their Reason, and deliver over themselves to the Management of those, whose Conduct has given them too much cause to suspect them.

(a) *Leo octavus* (ut ante dixi) *Protoscriniarius*, a Clero Populoque Romano, pulso Johanne, Pontifex creatur, *Plat. ib d.*

(b) *Barrow's Pope's Supremacy*, p. 713.

Mr. H. says next, that *I have trampled upon Authorities Sacred and Profane, and have misrepresented Facts.* But 'tis to be observ'd, that he is not able to produce any one Authority trampled on by me; nor any one Fact misrepresented. And therefore when he adds, that *I have got the better of my own Modesty, and of my Audience's Sense,* I may leave it to every intelligent Reader to judge, whether such positive and bold Assertions without Proof, and such unhandsom and indecent Reflections be agreeable either to *Modesty, or common Sense.*

He adds further, *He has built his own Mission on Error and Assurance, and resolves no other Persons shall stand on a better Foundation.* Here I crave leave to rectify our Rector's Mistake. I build my Mission on the *Sacred Scripture, right Reason, and the Practice of the Primitive Church*; upon the same Foundation on which all true Protestant Ministers Mission stands, i. e. on the free Election of the faithful People, with the Approbation of the Presbyters or Clergy, being ordain'd by the Imposition of the Hands of the true Primitive and Protestant Bishops, who pretend not to any Popish Fancies of an *uninterrupted Succession* or *indelible Character.* Had our Considerer a better Mission than this, I wish he would be so kind as to manifest it to the World, that we might know where to stand on a better Foundation. At present this is the Foundation of *Protestants*; nor can they have any better than what is built upon Scripture, right Reason, and the best Antiquity.

But I go on with our Considerer: *He raises an Objection as weak as he can, that he may answer it the more easily.* If my Objection has not the Strength of our Adversary's Opinion in it, it had been Mr. H's place to have rectify'd it, and shown its Weakness; and doubtless this he would have done, had it been true which he says. But because this is not done by him, the Reader will, I presume, take it for granted that the Objection is as strong as it need to be. So that as far as appears, I had no reason to do, what he falsely in the next place charges me with, that is, *apply to the Affections of my Audience, in order to captivate their Reason.*

But it seems, *I condemn the Mission of my Adversaries, and yet pretend to no better myself.* For the Proof of which he refers to p. 49. of my *Sermon*, in which there is not one word like Contempt of our Adversaries Mission.

In

In p. 34. he enters upon the Argument of a lineal Succession, and says: *The Succession of a Ministry is either true or false. If false, no Convenience ought to promote it. If true, no Inconvenience should prejudicate it. But the Horns of this Dilemma are too short and too weak to hurt; therefore I will venture to take hold of them. The Succession of a Protestant Ministry, that is, a Succession in the Apostles Doctrine, is true; therefore no Inconvenience should prejudicate it. But the Popish, pretended, uninterrupted Succession of Persons from the Apostle Peter thro the Church at Rome, is false; therefore no Inconvenience should promote it. 'Tis false, because the Line is so often and so notoriously broken by Schisms, Heresies, Simony, and the like. I presume the judicious Reader need not be advertis'd that our Dispute is not whether there be any true Succession of a Ministry; nor whether the Protestant Succession of a Ministry be true: but whether that Succession of a Ministry in the Protestant Church is only true and valid, which pretends to an uninterrupted Succession of Persons episcopally ordain'd, who derive their Episcopal Authority from the Apostle Peter thro Rome. This last our learned Rector affirms and maintains, that an uninterrupted Succession of Episcopal Power derived from the Apostles by Men episcopally ordained, is absolutely necessary to render all Ministerial Acts valid; and that he, and his Brethren of the Establish'd Church, have this uninterrupted Succession in fact in their Mission, and therefore their Mission is the only valid Mission. This is what we denied, and gave our Reasons for it. Whether the Reasons we gave are invalidated by our Considerer's Answers, must be now set before our Readers to judge. And in judging, I hope, they will not (I don't desire that they should) abandon their Reason; but like Christians, and good Protestants, exercise their Judgment and Reason.*

My first Reason was, that *this uninterrupted Succession was not only improbable, but impossible, without a continued Series of Miracles every Age to make it good: and 'tis not rational to think, that that allwise God and Governour of the World would put himself to the Expence of a continued Series of Miracles, without a visible Necessity. For we did not see any thing in the Nature of Episcopal Government to defend itself against the Pride, Ambition, Avarice, and Malice of designing Men, more than there is in the Nature of Civil Govern-*

Government ; which has been often interrupted in its Succession within half the time, which this uninterrupted Succession of Episcopal Power pretends to. What now does our learned Considerer return to this? Says he, *I can't find that he pretends to prove it impossible ; that it is improbable, he affirms, &c. Prove it impossible!* I need not give myself that trouble, the nature of the thing proves it so, without a continued Series of Miracles to maintain it. Here Mr. H. had an opportunity to shew his Learning and Sense, and have proved it was possible ; and not only possible, but probable : nay, not only so, but in fact that it was true. This would have been a Task worthy of a *Master of Arts*, and have merited the Thanks of his Brethren. But instead of this, he turns it off, without so much as offering any tolerable Reason to maintain his Point, unless the courteous Reader will be so good humour'd as to look on this to be any thing. Says he, *God has promised to be with the Governors of the Church to the end of the World, but no such Promise did he ever make to Civil Governors.* But what is this to the nature of each, which he was to answer to? But let's a little examine this, and see whether it be not too presumptuous. Is not *Civil Government an Ordinance of God* for the Good of Mankind? Are not *Civil Governors ordained of God*? Is not the Civil Governor the *Minister of God for Good*? The Reader may look over the 13th Chapter to the Romans (which Mr. H. on some peculiar Occasions can remember well enough, tho now 'tis forgotten) and there he will see that *Civil Governors* are under God's Care as well as Ecclesiastick ; and may as well, and as rationally, nay, as religiously expect the Presence and Blessing of God in the Discharge of their Duty, as Bishops in the Discharge of theirs. If this is true, as undoubtedly it is, then *Civil Government* is as stable and lasting as Ecclesiastical. But the Succession of Civil Government hath been often interrupted in half the time that this Ecclesiastical Government pretends to Uninterruption. But *God has promised it.* Was this Promise absolute to all Ecclesiastical Governors, whether good or bad, whether *Schismatics, Heretics, or Idolaters*? I presume not ; and yet this is what this learned Gentleman has to prove, or he does nothing to make this uninterrupted Succession more stable and lasting than the Succession of Civil Government ;
and

and till he has done this, we may very well conclude, that God will be with his *Ordinance* of Civil Government, as well as Ecclesiastical. But 'tis plain, what hath been, may be; God promised to be with *Aaron*, and with *David*, and their Successors, and yet both Lines were broken. So that notwithstanding God's Promise to be with Ecclesiastical Governors, the Succession may be, and, we have proved, is *actually broken*. For this Promise of God is to be understood to be made to those who shall continue faithful; not to *Hereticks*, *Murderers*, *Adulterers*, and *Idolaters*, many of which have been found in Mr. H's Line of Succession.

But he denies the Consequence, and says, that *the Argument* is a *posse ad esse*. It is impossible, because nobody can tell whether this Succession has not been broken, or may not be. This is a Mistake: for my Argument did not run a *posse ad esse*, but *ab impossibili ad non esse*. I said, that it was not possible without a continued Series of Miracles to make it good. I did not say, as our Considerer has represented, that 'twas possible that the Line might be broken, and therefore 'twas. But that it was impossible it should not be broken, and therefore 'twas impossible to have an uninterrupted Succession from a broken Line. For a Line but once broken will never yield uninterrupted Succession. Now we call on our Considerer to prove this Affirmative, that the Line is whole, or else for ever give up the Cause. If he will undertake it, for his Encouragement, if he prove the Premises, I assure him I will not deny the Conclusion. But if the Line is broken, 'tis egregious Folly to pretend uninterrupted Succession from a broken Line. To convince Mr. H. and his Readers that I am not alone in this Sentiment, I will produce some of his own Church, who are of my mind. The present Bishop of *Bangor* says, that 'it has not pleased God in his Providence to 'keep up any Proof of the least Probability, or moral 'Possibility, of a regular uninterrupted Succession. But 'there is a great Appearance, and, humanly speaking, 'a Certainty of the contrary; that this Succession hath 'been interrupted, especially in the Opinion of those 'who maintain all Lay-Baptism, and all Offices performed by Persons who either have been irregularly 'ordain'd, or have forged their Pretension to Ordination, to be mere Nullities' [and of this mind is Mr. H.]

And

And further says he: ' This regular uninterrupted Succession of Persons qualify'd and regularly ordain'd, is ' a Matter impossible to be proved (a). ' If Mr. H. should chance to be prejudiced against what this great Protestant Bishop has said, let him hear one who was under no Suspicion; whose Zeal for Episcopal Succession was never yet, as I know, call'd into question, and whose Learning and Capacity for judging, Mr. H. will own to be equal to his Zeal for the Church; I mean Mr. Dodwell, who says, ' That in a Revolution of Ages, ' there's no Succession in the World, but has some unjustifiable Turn. Nor is there any thing in the Nature of Ecclesiastical Government, as 'tis a Government of external Bodies, managed by Men of like Infirmities with those who are engaged with Civil Government, that can secure it against the like Violences of ambitious and unreasonable Men, who would judge too partially in their own Case. Such Violences on the Government may sometimes make a Breach in the due Succession, and affect the direct Conveyances of that Authority from God, which is requisite to the giving a Title to those spiritual Benefits to Souls, which are the great Design of Ecclesiastical Communion (b). ' I will add to this what the Author of the *Regale* says; a Man Mr. H. won't say is prejudiced against the Divine Right of Episcopacy. He ingenuously confesses, that ' it would be hard to find a Bishop against whom some of these Objections (relating to Succession) do not lie; for example, all the Bishops of the Reformation, as well in *England* as elsewhere, are struck off at one Blow; for they all derived from those whom they now account to be, and then to have been Hereticks. And the Ordinations of the Church of *Rome* must go off too, especially since the Council of *Constance*, that turn'd out all the Popes that were then in the World; which were three Popes contending one with another. They cannot say of any of their Ordinations at this day, that

(a) *Preservative*, p. 78, 79. 3 Edit.

(b) Doctrine of the Church of *England* concerning the Independency of the Clergy, §. 33. if the Rights of the Christian Church cite him right, p. 366.

' they are not derived from some of those Anti-Popes, &c. (a) ' I hope Mr. H's Reader after this will never dream of any Possibility of *regular uninterrupted Succession from the Church of Rome*.

But for Argument's sake, tho it is impossible in itself, we contented ourselves with saying, that 'twas not probable our Objectors themselves had an uninterrupted Succession from the Church of Rome, for which we gave three Reasons: 1. *Because the Romanists deny any such thing.* 2. *The Reformers renounced their Orders.* 3. *The great Historiographer of the Reformation has left it dubious.* From whence I argued, That if the Romanists deny that ever our Reformers had any regular Episcopal Orders from them; and our first Reformers disclaim'd any Popish Orders received from them, and Bishop Burnet own'd, that they went out of the beaten Road for their Mission: 'tis not very probable these Men should have those uninterrupted Orders they boast of. Had Mr. H. consider'd this as he ought, he would have seen it his part to have invalidated these Reasons, and have proved that they have in fact the Orders they pretend to. Let us then see what he has done towards it.

As to the Romanists Denial, he offers four things to prove his own Mission good from Rome. (1.) Says he, *If this be a good Argument against the Church of England, it is also good against our Author.* To which I reply, That here he mistakes the Case altogether; for tho 'tis good against him, 'tis not against me. I don't pretend to claim any Authority from them; but he claims from them what they constantly deny he ever had. Here Mr. H. should have demonstrated the contrary, that notwithstanding their Denial, he had these uninterrupted Orders. 'Tis an odd way of arguing, to prove his own Mission good, to say, *If this is good against the Church of England, 'tis good against our Author too*; for if his Antagonist's Mission is bad also, that don't make his good. (2.) Says he, *The Evidence of Enemies is always bold exceptionable, &c.* This was allow'd, and therefore I said, that this alone was not to be depended on, but the following Argument confirm'd it. (3.) He says, *Pope Paul IV. and Cardinal Pool will inform our Author better: let*

him consult the Legate's Dispensation, granted at the Request of the whole Nation, and extending as well to Orders as Benefices. At this Proof, that Mr. H's Orders are good and regular from Rome, the Reader may stand amaz'd! Was there ever a true Protestant that thus claim'd? Pope Paul IV. by Cardinal Pool his Legate, dispensed with those Irregularities in the Orders of the *English* Clergy in the Days of King Edward VI. ergo, our Reformers in Queen Elizabeth's Days received regular Orders from Rome. It seems by this, that the Orders of the *English* reform'd Clergy were so irregular in King Edward's Days, that they needed the Pope's Dispensation to make them regular, and without that Dispensation they must have continued as they were, i. e. irregular. But this Dispensation, tho good in Queen Mary's Days, was at an end in Queen Elizabeth's. And Queen Elizabeth's Reformers Orders being as irregular as King Edward's, they must need also a dispensing Pope and Cardinal to render them valid. But alas! Pope Paul and Cardinal Pool are dead, and Pope Pius V. instead of confirming their Orders by his Bull, dispensing with their Irregularities, damns Queen Elizabeth, and all her Schismatical Adherents at once. If the Orders of the *English* Clergy were irregular, and consequently invalid in King Edward's Days, without the Pope's Dispensation to render them valid; then the Orders of the *English* Clergy must be the same in Queen Elizabeth's Days: and those Irregularities being never dispensed with by any Pope, but condemn'd by Pope Pius (alias Impius) V. they must of consequence remain irregular and invalid, in the Esteem of the *Romanists*, and according to Mr. H. if they need the Pope's Dispensation to render them valid. For they were never yet by any dispensing Pope render'd valid. And I hope the *Whole Nation* will never more be so complaisant to the Pope, as humbly to crave his Holiness's Dispensation for the Irregularities of the Clergy's Orders. Upon the whole, I presume Mr. H. will not merit the Thanks of the true Protestant Clergy of the Establish'd Church, for this his very fine Compliment pass'd upon their Orders; that if they are regular, it's owing to the Condescension of the Pope, that he was pleased to dispense with their Irregularities. What strange Work is this! Mr. H. to make his own, and his Brethren's Orders good and valid, depends on

the *Pope's Dispensation*; a rare Protestant! (4.) Says Mr. H. to make his Mission valid, *The Inconsistency of the Romish Pretences is such, that Mr. D. would despise in his cool Minutes.* To which I answer, I am not concern'd in the Pretences of the *Romanists* Denial; but only in their Denial. But, methinks, Mr. H. has confirm'd the *Romanists* in their Denial, by allowing one of their Pretences good, viz. that their Orders are not good without the Pope's Dispensation, which the *Romanists* insist upon; and that they are irregular till the Dispensation is granted, and when it is granted, the *Romanists* Denial will be at an end: they will receive Mr. H. as a Brother in Holy Orders, without Reordination, as well as he receives a *Romish* Priest now. But till this is done, how inconsistent soever their Pretences are, they will persist in their Denial. I advise Mr. H. to sit down and consider again, whether Pope *Pius's* Censure, or Bull of Excommunication, in Queen *Elizabeth's* Days, was not as authentick to damn the Irregularities of our Reformers Orders; as Pope *Paul's* Bull was to confirm the Orders received in King *Edward's* Days?

To my 2. Reason, That our Reformers renounced all *Popish* Orders, Mr. H. says, *He cites Whitaker and Fulk, without ever telling his Reader the Page.* I answer, If this is a Fault, Mr. H. is himself also faulty; and 'twill, I believe, appear to his Reader unreasonable to carp at that in me, which he does himself. In p. 24. he is not only negligent of the *Page*, but the very *Book*: he cites Authors Names, but not the Books. But it seems, tho the *Page* is not told, the Evidence is admitted, and not to be deny'd; therefore what he can't deny, he endeavours to evade and elude. Says he, (1.) *Tho Whitaker and Fulk renounced it, it does not follow that the Reformed Church did, unless the Opinions of two Divines of a Church be esteemed the Tenet of the whole Church.* To which I answer, When two eminent Divines are managing the Cause of the Reformed Church against its Adversaries, and they write not only their own Opinions, but the Opinions, in that Cause, of the whole Body; and are not contradicted by any other Divines at the same time; then what those two Champions assert to the World, is to be justly esteemed the Opinion of that Reformed Church: which is the Case of *Whitaker* and *Fulk*. They were writing against the Enemies of the Reformer.

Reformation, and no other Divines of the Reformation did contradict them, as I can find. To these two I will now add a third, who was a vigorous Defender of the Reformation, perhaps not inferior to the former. I mean Dr. *Willet*, who, in his *Answers to Bellarmine*, is full to this Point with *Whitaker* and *Fulk*. Says he, ' We hold, that an Ordination from the Apostles is always necessary in the Church, but not such as they [*i. e.* the *Romanists*] mean by local Succession, and outward Tradition; but a lawful Consecration and ordering of Pastors and Ministers by the Authority of Christ and his Apostles, according to the Word of God, committed to the faithful Dispensers in every true Church, and Congregation of Christ; which Ordination our Church hath: as for their *superstitious Ordination*, we refuse it as *superfluous and unnecessary*. There may be lawful Bishops and Pastors without it, as there were Prophets in the Law not of *Aaron*; yea, and much more, for the *Priesthood of Aaron* was of God's Institution, so is not your *Papish Consecration* (a). That this was the Sense and Opinion of the *English Reformed Church*, and not his own Opinion alone, may be seen in his Epistle Dedicatory to *Queen Elizabeth* herself. In which he says, ' Most Gracious and Dread Sovereign, I have presumed now this third time, to present this general Treatise to your Sacred Majesty; wherein is contain'd the whole Sum of that Holy Faith and Religion, which your Highness maintaineth, the *Church of England* professeth, which your Royal Scepter upholdeth, and this *Christian Realm* believeth.' Thus 'tis manifest, that what *Whitaker* and *Fulk* asserted, was the Sense of the whole Reformation both at home and abroad. And our Considerer owns, (2.) that *Both are speaking of the Roman Ritual*, it is, says he, *what they valued not; and there is in one of these Passages an indecent Reflection upon the Unction*. By this the Reader will see, that our Considerer, tho unwillingly, and with some Reluctancy, gives up the Cause he seems to contend for. Can any Man be so senseless as to think, that these Reformed Divines should thus slight and speak indecently of the *Romish Consecrations*,

(a) *Willet's Synopf. Papif. p. 68, Edit. 2. Ann. 1600.*

if they knew that they had no valid Orders without it ; or that all their Ministerial Authority depended thereon ? Their slighting the *Roman Ritual*, and their indecent Reflection on the *Romish* Consecration, is as full an Evidence as we can desire, that they did not depend thereon for their Mission. I presume the Reader will consider well this learned Gentleman's Reasoning : our Reformers did not value the *Romish Ritual*, and spake disrespectfully and indecently of the *Consecration* ; ergo, they received their uninterrupted Orders from the *Romanists*. He next asks a very weighty Question, (3.) *What occasion there was for Queen Elizabeth to renew her Letters missive ?* Bishop Bramhall, when he was puzzled with this Question, only suggests, that the Commission was renew'd, because in the first, which was not executed, there wanted an *aut minus*, or at least four of you (a). But the *Romanists* say, 'twas because the true, staunch, Catholick Bishops refused to obey, and the Queen, willing that her Church should, in outward appearance at least, resemble the *Roman Church* then in vogue, resolved to have Bishops, tho they were of her own making. Therefore seeing the Catholicks would not obey, she renewed her Commission, and sent it to the Protestant Bishops, that they might consecrate those whom she had nominated after their own way, and not *Romano more* ; and these Ordinations were afterwards, instead of the *Pope's Dispensation*, confirm'd by *Act of Parliament*. From hence the *Romans* call the *English Bishops Parliament Bishops*, i. e. *Lay Bishops* of the Parliament's making. By all this it fully appears, that the pains taken by Mr. H. to make good his Point, turns to the Disadvantage of his Cause.

To my 3. Reason, viz. ' Bishop Burnet's Concession, ' that they went out of the beaten Path for their Mission,' Mr. H. only raises a Dust, that he might slip away, and lose his Reader in the Cloud. Every body, who has read Bishop Burnet, must know, that however he asserted Episcopacy to be a regular Order, he never pretended that Episcopal Authority, uninterrupted from the Apostles, was absolutely necessary to a regular and valid Mission. He that has read his *Exposition of the*

(a) Bp Bramhall's Consecration and Succession, p. 46.

23d Article, can't but see that is far from his Thoughts. For he there labours to show, that the Orders in the reformed Churches abroad were valid, notwithstanding they did not proceed from, or according to the *Roman Rule*, which was the standing Rule in those Days. He first endeavours to prove, that the Orders in his own Church were valid, notwithstanding they went out of the *beaten Path*. ' For, says he, on the other hand, ' when the Body of the Clergy comes to be so corrupted, ' that nothing can be trusted to the regular Decisions of ' any Synod, or Meeting, called according to their Constitution ; then, if the Prince shall select a peculiar ' Number, and commit to their Care the examining ' and reforming both of Doctrine and Worship, and ' shall give the legal Sanction to what they shall offer ' to him ; we must confess that such a Method as this ' runs contrary to the established Rules, and that therefore it ought very seldom to be put in practice ; and ' never, except when the Greatness of the Occasion ' will ballance the Irregularity that is in it. But here ' is an Authority in *Fact* and *Right* ; for if the Magistrate ' hath Power to make Laws in sacred Matters, he ' may order those to be prepared by whom, and as he ' pleases.' Thus that truly Protestant Bishop vindicates what was done in King *Edward VI.* and in Queen *Elizabeth's* Days, in constituting the present Church of *England* ; and shows, that tho they did go out of the beaten Path, and had not an uninterrupted Succession, they had a lawful Mission both in *Fact* and *Right*. And he adds further, ' If a Company of Christians find the ' Publick Worship, where they live, to be so defiled, ' that they cannot with a good Conscience join with it ; ' [*as it was at the Reformation*] and if they do not know ' of any Place to which they can conveniently go, ' where they may worship God purely, and in a regular way : if, I say, such a Body finding some that ' have been ordained, tho to the lower Functions, should ' submit itself to their Conduct ; or finding none of ' those, should, by a common Consent, desire some of ' their own Number to minister to them in holy things, ' and should from that beginning grow up to a regulated Constitution ; tho we are very sure, that this is ' quite out of all Rule, and could not be done without ' a very great Sin, unless the Necessity was great ' and

and apparent; yet if the Necessity be real, and not feign'd, this is not condemn'd, nor annull'd by the Article: for when this grows to a Constitution, and when it was begun by the *Consent of a Body*, who are supposed to have an *Authority* in such an extraordinary Case, whatever some hotter Spirits have thought of this since that time; yet we are very sure, that not only those who penn'd the Articles, but the Body of this Church, for above half an Age after, did, notwithstanding those Irregularities, acknowledge the foreign Churches, so constituted, to be true Churches, as to all the Essentials of a Church, tho they had been at first irregularly founded (a). Thus we see, that this learned Prelate was far from asserting what Mr. H. would suggest of him, as tho he was of his mind, that *uninterrupted Succession of Episcopal Authority was absolutely necessary* for a true and valid Mission; and damning the Mission of all others who pretend not to it, as Mr. H. does. Hence I conclude, 'tis no Injury to the Memory of the Bishop, to infer, that when he strenuously endeavours to maintain the Validity of the Ministry of the present Bishops and Priests in the establish'd Church, that he don't intend an *uninterrupted Succession from the Apostles thro Rome*; but a true *Protestant Succession*, either according to the Authority of the Prince, who is supposed to have the Will of the People in him, with the Consent of some of the best of the Clergy, which is the true Succession of the establish'd Church, and those who derive from them; or by the Consent of the People alone, and grown up to a regulated Constitution, as in some foreign Churches. So that what we cited from the Bishop is not so dubious as Mr. H. would persuade his Reader to believe it is, but plain and clear; which shows what the Bishop's Sentiments were of the Successions of Protestants.

But to prove this, it seems, I have only cited a dubious Passage out of his *Exposition of the Articles*, which may as well be referred (nay, much better) to *Form, as Succession*. If Mr. H. means by *Form*, the *Form of Succession* (which, to do him justice, he must mean, if he means any

(a) Bp Burnet's *Exposition* on 23 Article, p. 258, 259. Edit. 3.

thing) he is desired in his next Considerations to show how uninterrupted Succession can be convey'd without its *Form*? Can any thing be convey'd without a *Form*? Is it not the *Form* of any thing that gives it its Denomination? Hath not uninterrupted Succession an uninterrupted *Form*? Can this Succession be convey'd without its *Form*? And hath not Catholick Succession Catholick *Form*? Now, if Catholick uninterrupted Succession, hath Catholick uninterrupted *Form*; then going out of the beaten Path for the *Form*, has lost the Succession, unless we are resolved to renounce our Senses, and say, Subjects may be without their Accidents: and if so, we may yield to *Transubstantiation* without hesitation, and conclude the real Body and Blood of Christ may be in the Sacrament without its *Form*; even under the *Form* of Bread and Wine. This is the same as to say, that Catholick uninterrupted Succession may be convey'd under an Heretical Protestant *Form*.

To what Mr. *H.* is pleased to say of Mr. *Ward's* Book, I answer, That I have nothing to do with it, but as a Witness; and as to its *Improbability*, *Ignorance*, or *Mistakes*, I shall leave them for Mr. *H.* or his Brethren, to correct. Tho, instead of those trifling Reflections and Evasions, it had been more to his purpose to have proved, contrary to Mr. *Ward* and his Brethren, that our Reformers had received Catholick uninterrupted Succession, and that by Catholick uninterrupted *Form* (notwithstanding Bishop *Burnet* had unwarily granted, or dubiously express'd, that they went out of the *beaten Path*.) Otherwise to talk of uninterrupted Succession from the Catholick Church, is mere Cant, or Words without any Meaning.

But if Mr. *H.* could do this, which is more than he pretends to do; yet even that, when proved, will do his Cause no service, because the Church at *Rome* was become *Antichristian*. And 'tis a meer Jest to say, Antichrist can convey valid Orders to any Men to preach the Gospel of Christ. Our Blessed Lord never gave Antichrist any such Power. If they say that the Church of *Rome* was only corrupt, and not Antichristian, and could give a valid Mission; then the Reformation was a *Schism*, and not a lawful *Separation* (for according to these Men's Principles, every Separation from a true
O Church,

Church, tho' she is corrupt, is Schismatical) and our Reformers must be a Company of Schismatics, and as such, were damn'd by the Church at Rome; and these Men, if they have any Mission, must come from these damn'd Hereticks and Schismatics. What now does our wise Considerer say to this? Our Author, distrusting his Citations out of Authors he had never seen, his Misrepresentations of those he had seen, and the Forgeries of some he had made Friends of in the Cause, begins a needless Engagement: 'Rome being Antichristian, lost her Power of giving Orders, p. 39. One would think this Gentleman had got an Indulgence from Rome to speak any thing to promote the true Catholick Cause, that he can give himself the Liberty thus to write. In short, there is not one word of Truth in what he affirms here. I neither *distrusted my Citation*, nor *misrepresented any Author*, nor *forged any to make them Friends to my Cause*. Let him reconcile this with the Honour of his Function. But 'tis really very pleasant to see how our zealous Protestant Rector turns and winds, shifts and boggles at this Term *Antichrist*. This is, it seems, a very tender Point to handle; he seems to touch it, as tho' 'twas a *Noli me tangere*. How soft he speaks, how carefully he distinguishes, as if he was afraid to offend his Catholick Brethren, considering, perhaps, that the World is liable to Revolutions? Says he, *Our Author plays with the word Antichristian*. But in this our Considerer makes a palpable Mistake. I used that Term in no other Sense, as is evident, than what our Reformers used it in; and how they used it, may be seen in their Writings. Dr. Willet shall speak for all, who tells us, (a) that 'Antichrist is a secret and close Enemy to Christ and his Church; who, under the pretext and colour of Religion, is a cruel Enemy, one whose Practices and Principles are altogether inconsistent with the Rules of the Gospel, and the Honour of Christ: and such they affirm the Pope and his Clergy to be; tho' they professed the Name of Christ, they are Apostates from his Truths, guilty of gross and abominable Lewdness in Morals, corrupt in Principles, practising open and damnable

(a) Willet's Synops. Papis. on the Tenth Question concerning Antichrist.

‘ Idolatry, barbarously persecuting the true Worship-
 ‘ pers of the Lord.’ All which, and much more, were
 the *Romanists* guilty of, and still are ; and yet our Pro-
 testant Rector is afraid to say they are Antichristian.
Antichrist, says he, *is, properly speaking, such a Person as*
is directly opposite to Christ, so as to deny his Mission, and
pretend his Authority. Where he had this nice Definition
 of *Antichrist*, I will not determine. *Antichrist is, properly*
speaking, such a Person as is directly opposite to Christ, (so
 far we may be in some measure right.) But the Pope of
 Rome, and his Clergy, and idolatrous and barbarous
 Crew, are directly opposite to Christ ; *ergo*, the Church
 at Rome is Antichristian. But he adds, *So as to deny his*
Mission, and pretend his Authority. Where he will find
 such an *Antichrist*, I know not. If he means by *Mission*,
 Christ coming in the *Flesh* ; according to Scripture, in-
 deed, we find such *Antichrists*, who strenuously deny’d
 Christ to be come in the *Flesh*, and that oppos’d his Doc-
 trine (a). But we don’t find any of them such Block-
 heads, as at the same time to *pretend his Authority*. Such
 would be strange Antichrists indeed ! What can be
 more ridiculous than for a Man to *pretend to the Autho-*
rity of him, whose Coming in the Flesh he denies? No
 such Antichrists, to be sure, are any where, or at any
 time to be found. If our Considerer means by this
 Term *Mission*, an *Authority* to do any thing in Christ’s
 Name ; then here is a Contradiction in the Definition,
 or some great *Mystery*, as dark as the *Mystery of Iniquity*
 itself, above my Comprehension, that Antichrist should
 be so silly and witless, as to *pretend to the Authority*
which he denies : for he, it seems, *denies Christ’s Mission,*
 and yet *pretends to his Authority* ; than which, if any
 thing can be wilder, let Mr. H. himself declare. I
 hope, when he has consider’d this again, we shall have
 this *Mystery* unveiled ; till then we must be contented
 to abide in the dark. He goes on, *Antichrist, catachres-*
tically speaking, is such an one, as holding Christ for the
Head, acts in one thing, or in many Particulars, contrary to
that Holy Religion which he hath given us. *Antichristian in*
this latter Sense is corrupt. Where Mr. H. will find in
 Scripture any Person called *Antichrist catachrestically*, or

(a) 1 John ii. 22. —iv. 2, 3. Epist. 2. v. 7.

improperly, which was not really Antichrist, I do not know; he has not yet vouchsafed to tell us: we must also wait for this till the next time he is pleased to consider this Matter. The Scripture gives us to understand, that Antichrist is one not only *corrupt* in his Notions of Christ, or in his Practice of Christ's Precepts; but one who *opposes* Christ, and is an Adversary to him, and his true Worshipers; and sets up himself *against* Christ, or in Christ's stead, as his Vicar. In short, he is the worst and most vile Enemy Christ and his Church have. But he adds, *In the former* [Sense it] *cannot be apply'd to a Christian Church, such as Mr. D. allows the Popish Church to be.* Verily, Mr. H. is here in the right; no Christian Church, nor Antichristian (such as I believe the Papist Church to be) can be so stupidly foolish, as to deny *Christ's Mission*, and yet at the same time to *own his Authority*. Mr. H. by the way, is deceived, if he thinks I allow the Papist Church to be any otherwise Christian than in Name only; I use the Term Church *vulgariter*.

Mr. H. next propounds a Pair of puzzling Questions. First, *Whether a corrupt Church can give Orders.* I answer, a Church so corrupted, as to become Antichristian, such as the *Romish Church* was at the Reformation, cannot give Orders; for it hath none to give. Secondly, *Whether it is lawful to separate from a corrupt Church?* I answer, Yes; and therefore the Separation of our Reformers from the Church at Rome, was not Schism, but a lawful Separation. Says Mr. H. *If Mr. D. designs to write to the purpose, let him lay aside his Jesuitical Sophistry, and prove the Negative of these Questions.* What, *Prove the Negative of these Questions?* Has Mr. H. forgot, *Affirmantis est probare?* But while he is advising me to lay aside *Jesuitical Sophistry*, he is acting the *Sophister* himself. He goes from a particular Church to any Church indefinitely. Now the Church we were considering, was the Church at Rome; and therefore the Questions should have been fairly stated, thus: *viz.* Whether the Church of Rome at the Reformation was only corrupt, and not become Antichristian? And, Whether it was lawful to separate from the Church of Rome, being only corrupt, and not become Antichristian? But instead of these Questions, Mr. H's part, to make his uninterrupted Orders good and valid, was (1.) to have shewn,

shewn, That the Church at *Rome* was a true Church, and had valid Mission to give, which is by me deny'd, and which he never pretends in the least to prove. He should likewise have proved, to vindicate the Reformation, that it was lawful to separate from the Church at *Rome*, tho she was not Antichristian, and had valid Mission to give, she being only in one or more Particulars corrupt. This Mr. *H.* dares not touch, as being the darling Principle of his Party, that 'tis *damnable Schism* to separate from a true Church, tho she is corrupt. Again, he should have proved, that Schismatics from the true Church at *Rome* can have true and valid Mission, tho damn'd by that true Church for their Schism. This Mr. *H.* has not in the least attempted to do, tho he was provoked thereto. Says Mr. *H.* To call a Society, *Antichristian* in the former Sense of the Word, a Church, and to talk of separating from it, is Nonsense; and to say that a corrupt Church can't confer Orders, is little better. Mr. *H.* is here certainly in the right; for as 'tis Nonsense to call Antichrist one who denies Christ's Mission, and yet pretends to his Authority; so it must be equal Nonsense to call a Society of such Persons he here speaks of, a Church, and to talk of separating from it. But who talks at this nonsensical rate? Nobody but Mr. *H.* This nonsensical Antichristian Church is of Mr. *H.*'s own forming. We never said, that a corrupt Church cannot give Orders; but we assert, that the *Roman* Antichristian Church had no valid Orders to give: and to say it has, is Mr. *H.*'s Nonsense, and not mine, which we oppose. But why is Mr. *H.* so very cautious and shy of owning the Church at *Rome* to be Antichristian, and no true Church? Has he forgot what he subscribed to, and what the *Articles* of the Church are? Or has he taken upon trust what he subscribed to, and never read those *Homilies*, which contain godly and wholesome Doctrine, and necessary for these Times? In the second Part of the *Homily* for *Whitsunday*, it is declared, That the Church of *Rome*, as it is presently, and hath been for the space of nine hundred Years and odd, is so far wide from the Nature of the true Church, that nothing can be more. What is this less than to say, the Church at *Rome* is not a true Church? Now after this, one would think Mr. *H.* should not scruple to own what he has subscribed to as wholesome and godly Doctrine; viz. that the Church at

Rome

Rome is not a true Church: for what is so far wide from the Nature of a true Church, that nothing can be more, cannot be a true Church.

To what Mr. H. says of a virtuous Son from a vitious Parent; I only say this, that as the Son had not his Father's Vices, so he had not his Virtue from him, but from God: so the Churches and Ministers of the Reformation, tho they came from Rome, as a vitious Parent, they derive all their Virtue and Christianity from God, and nothing from Rome. That a godly Priest among the Jews might have an idolatrous Father, is probable, but nothing to Mr. H's purpose. For the Priesthood among the Jews was by natural Generation, and no moral Defect in the Father was to hinder the Son. But now under the Gospel, 'tis far otherwise, when Succession comes not by natural Generation. Under the Gospel, Priests are obliged to moral Qualifications; and by their Apostacy, they lose their Title to the Priesthood, and may be deprived and degraded. As for instance, when a Priest becomes an Idolater, and continues such *ipso facto*, he loses his Right and Title to the Christian Priesthood; he is no more a Priest, and whatever Priesthood this Priest pretends to give, is in reality a Nullity. And such is all the pretended Priesthood of the Church at Rome. Let Mr. H. now prove, that gross Idolaters can convey true and valid Priesthood to any Man, or let him write no more on this Controversy; for according to our Reformers, the Romanists were a Company of Idolaters, and have no Christian Priesthood to give.

But, says he, *What Mr. D. is appriz'd of*, p. 56. *is urged only by the Assembly of Divines, as I have formerly told him; and if he pleases, he may account with their Abettors for it.* I answer, what I was there appriz'd of, was asserted by Mr. H. in one of his former Letters to me, and therefore I must account with him for it.

In my Sermon, p. 59. I had said to this purpose: 'But if we should allow that the Church at Rome was not Antichristian, nor our Reformers Schismatics, which you see is altogether inconsistent; yet Lay Baptisms, Heresies, Schisms, and Simony, make it impossible to derive uninterrupted Succession thro that Church.' As to Lay Baptism, Mr. H. is so generous as to grant all I say; and tho I discover a want of Reading and Attention in antient and modern Books, he will give me a full Answer.

In

In return for this Civility and Generosity of Mr. H. I only say, That what I want of Reading and Attention in antient and modern Books, Mr. H. abundantly compensates; and that he has made evident to his Reader, by granting all the Premises, and denying the Conclusion: which no Man, except one of Mr. H's Reading and close Attention, would venture to do. He says, (1.) *Titles to any thing are not to be set aside by Suppositions, but Facts.* True; but Defects in supposed Titles, and granted to be possible, render such Titles precarious and uncertain: which was all we aim'd at, to show that 'twas morally impossible, from these possible Defects in the Baptism of the Roman Church, to be certain of uninterrupted Succession thro that Church. For uninterrupted Succession must run in Persons regularly baptiz'd, and regularly ordain'd. Therefore, (2.) Mr. H. says, *If Suppositions were so far allow'd, no Man could be safe in his Possession.* I answer, No Man can be safe in his Possession of this uninterrupted Mission; because these supposed Defects show, that 'tis possible for him to be deceived, as to his Claim of Right. (3.) Says he, *The Aaronical Succession might be said as well to be interrupted by a supposed Bastardy, as ours by a supposed want of Baptism.* We readily allow, that the Aaronical Succession, tho it was commanded of God, might not only be interrupted by a Supposition of Bastardy, but was actually interrupted often by other Accidents; from hence we conclude, that 'tis the greatest Vanity for any now to pretend to uninterrupted Succession from the Apostles: for as the Jews had the Ordinances of instituted Worship, notwithstanding those Interruptions, and that Interruption of the Succession did not render their present Priests Administrations invalid (and that they did not, is plain from our Blessed Saviour's joining with them in their Administration) so we Protestants may have a valid Mission, tho the Line of Succession be interrupted. (4.) Mr. H. says, *That when this Author thinks fit to prove the Fact, I'll undertake the farther Defence of the Case.* I answer, I have no need to prove the Fact; the Supposition is enough for my Cause, and too much for Mr. H's: as the Bishop of Bangor has asserted (a).

(a) Preservative, p. 78.

I farther said, ' That if we could slip over this Difficulty, and make but little of it; yet *Schisms*, *Heresies*, and *Simony* in that Church are such a Gordian Knot, which can never be untied,' p. 60. Mr. H. says, *This Assertion is loose*. But the Reader may see by his Answer given, that the Knot is so fast tied, that his Efforts are too weak to loosen it. *As to the Heresies and Schisms in the antient Church, this was the Rule: If those respective Heresies and Schisms did preserve among them the Succession Episcopal, they were deemed capable, upon Reconciliation, of holding every Man his respective Station, whether Bishop, Priest, or Deacon. See the Case of the Donatists, Novatians, and Arians, &c. But if they went either upon a Presbyterian, or an Enthusiastical one, such as that of Ischiras, or Manes, their Ordinations were esteemed null and void.* In this Rule, Mr. H. cunningly supposes the only thing in question on this Head, which is, Whether Hereticks and Schismatics can preserve among them the true Apostolical Succession? We say, No; Heresy and Schism breaks the Line. Our Considerer is on the Affirmative, and the only Proof he brings, is a Supposition of the thing in question, *viz. If they preserved the Succession Episcopal, then they are deemed capable, upon Reconciliation, to hold their several Stations and Dignities in the Church, &c. But if they went on a Presbyterian or an Enthusiastical one, such as Ischiras, or Manes, then their Ordinations were esteemed null and void.* This Distinction favours so much of Novelty, that we conclude it must be some modern Invention. And it being so very nice and curious, I am not willing to envy Mr. H. the Honour of being the Author of it. I therefore desire him in his next, to demonstrate to the World what the real Difference is. Let him show, that there is that Malignity in *Presbyterian Heresy*, which is not in *Episcopal*. For if *Presbyterian Heresy* can destroy the Authority convey'd to the Presbyters by the Hands of one Orthodox Bishop, that they need a fresh Ordination; and *Episcopal Heresy* has not the same Force to destroy *Episcopal Authority*, convey'd to them by the Hands of three Bishops: then I conclude, it must be from one or other of these Reasons; *viz. either the Power of Presbyterian Heresy is greater to destroy that Quid indelebile, convey'd into the Noddles of Presbyters by the Hands of one Bishop; or else the Force of one*

Pair

Pair of Hands was not strong enough to imprint that Character so deep, as the Force of three Pair. I expect that Mr. H. in his next will oblige the World with some curious Discoveries in this Case, to make his Rule good. For if this was the Rule among the Antients, and there appear no real Difference in the Nature of the Heresies, but the Nature of Presbyterian Heresy and Episcopal Heresy is the same; then with us Moderns, this *Rule of the Antients* is no better than a crooked Stick, and to be thrown away as of no use.

But as crooked as this Rule is, let us consider it; what Proof does Mr. H. produce for it? For the former part, which is ridiculous in itself, he brings no Authority as Proof, but only says, *Antiquity is full as to that*. But of what? Of Instances to the contrary. Can Mr. H. think his bare Assertions should be taken for a Matter of such moment? For according to Mr. H's Principle, without uninterrupted Succession, there can be no true Administration, no valid Mission, no valid Baptism, and consequently, no Salvation. And to prove this uninterrupted Succession, he was to shew, that the vilest Hereticks, and worst of Schismatics, are capable of conveying it down to us; without which Proof, no Man can have any Certainty of his Salvation, on Mr. H's Principle. And now, for the Proof of this important Truth, he contents himself with saying, *Antiquity is full of it*. As to the latter part, he says, *He that desires to see a Proof of it* [i.e. that the Ordinations of Presbyterian, or Enthusiastick, Hereticks and Schismatics were deemed null and void] *may consult Athanasius, Apol. 2. Socrat. Eccles. Hist. lib. 1. c. 27. 1 Concil. Nic. Can. 19. Epiphan. Heres. 66. Socrates saves us the labour of searching Athanasius's Apology, having given us Athanasius's Opinion in this Case.* 'The Emperor Constantine sent to Athanasius to readmit Arius and his Accomplices to Communion, and to his Dignity in the Church. Athanasius acquainted the Emperor, that it was impossible for those who had once rejected the Faith, and were anathematiz'd, to be entirely readmitted again to their Degrees in the Church, at their Return (a).'

(a) Αθανάσιος μὲν ἐν πάντῃ τὸ δέξασθαι αὐτὸς ἀπηγόρευσε. ὁ τὸν βασιλεῖα γράφον ἐδίδασκεν, ἀδύνατον εἶναι τὰς ἀπαξ τὴν πίσιν ἀπετήσαντας, καὶ ἀναδεμαπιδέντας, αὐτοῖς ἐξ ὑποθέσεως συλλαμβάνεσθαι.

Mr. H. says, *Every Man, whether Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, on Reconciliation, was to hold his Station in the Church, as we may see in the Case of the Arians, &c.* And for this, *Antiquity is full.* But we see unhappily, *Atbanasius*, an Orthodox Father, was of another mind, and that in opposition to the Emperor's Desire, and in hazard of his Bishoprick. So far is Antiquity from being full for his Point, that here we see 'tis diametrically opposite. But perhaps Mr. H. may say, this is but one Bishop. True; but 'tis one to whom Mr. H. appealed.

He also refers us to the Council of *Nice*. Let us hear what they testify to this. This Council not only anathematiz'd *Arius* and his Followers, of what Dignity or Degree soever in the Church; but deposed and degraded the *Melesians*, and not only those of the lower Degrees, but *Meletius* himself, their Bishop. Thus we see how straight Mr. H's Rule of the Antients is. By this Council, Bishops upon their Return were not permitted to exercise any Episcopal Function, the only Favour they had, was to retain the Name; as may be seen in their Synodical Letter recorded by *Socrates*. Their Words are, 'It pleased therefore the Synod, that he [i. e. *Meletius*] should continue in his City, but have no Jurisdiction, either to ordain, or to propose the Names of those who were to be ordain'd, or to appear in any Village or City upon this pretence; but that he should barely enjoy his Appellation and Title only (a).' Mr. H. can't say, that *Meletius*, the Heretick and Schismatick, did not preserve the Succession Episcopal; and yet at his Return, and Reconciliation, he was not deemed capable of holding his respective Station. Where now is Mr. H's Rule among the Antients? The very Council he refers to, condemns the Cause he is pleading.

But perhaps Mr. H. to elude this, may say, this is not what he referred us to. That we may see that the Council are not inconsistent, but uniform in their Opinion, the XIX Canon, to which Mr. H. appeals, af-

(a) *Socrat. Hist. lib. i. c. 9.* Μέλειν ἐν τῇ πόλει ἐαυτῷ καὶ μηδεμίαν ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν αὐτὸν, μήτε χειροθετεῖν, μήτε περὶ εἰσεῖς, μήτε ἐν χώρᾳ, μήτε ἐν πόλει ἐτέρα φαίνεσθαι, ταύτης δὲ περφορέως ἕνεκα, ψιλὸν δὲ τὸ ὄνομα τῷ πρὶν κεκληθῆναι.

firm the same thing. The *Canon* runs thus: 'If any
 ' of the *Paulianists* or *Cataphrygians* come back to the
 ' Catholick Church, we decree that they ought to be
 ' baptized. But if any among them be Clergymen,
 ' if they are indeed without Fault, and irreprehensible,
 ' they also are to be reordained by a Bishop of the
 ' Catholick Church; but if upon Examination they are
 ' found unworthy, let them be deposed. The same
 ' Rule shall be observed with respect to Deacons, and
 ' concerning all who are found of the Clergy (a).'
 How Mr. H. will account with his Reader for this, I
 know not; I shall leave them to adjust this Matter be-
 tween themselves.

But if Mr. H. to evade the Force of this Citation,
 should now pretend that he has miscited the *Canon*, and
 that the *Canon* he intended was the VIII. which par-
 ticularly respects the *Novatians*: let it be so. We will
 attend to what the Council says in *Canon VIII*. If any
 of the *Novatians* are willing to come to the (b) Catholick
 Church, this Council decrees, 'They shall be ordain'd,
 ' and so remain in the Clergy. But before all things,
 ' let them have this Confession from them, which is
 ' required by the Scripture, that they in all things con-
 ' form to the Rules of the Catholick Church; but if
 ' any of them were ordained by the Catholicks, they
 ' shall remain without Ordination. And if there happen
 ' to be a Bishop or Presbyter in that Catholick Church,

(a) Si quis confugit ad Ecclesiam catholicam (de Pau-
 lianistis & Cataphrygis) statutum est rebaptizare eos debe-
 re. Si vero Clerici erant apud eos, si quidem inculpati fue-
 rint & irreprehensibiles, rursus etiam ordinentur ab Epif-
 copo Ecclesiæ catholicæ. Si vero examinati minus fuerint
 apti deprehensi, deponi eos oportet. Similiter autem &
 circa Diaconos, & de omnibus qui in eodem Clero inve-
 niuntur, eadem forma servabitur, *Magd. Hist. Cent. iv. c. 9.*
de Synodis.

(b) Si qui voluerint venire ad Ecclesiam catholicam ex
 Novatianis, placuit sancto concilio ut ordinentur, & sic
 maneat in Clero. Ante omnia autem hanc habeant ab eis
 confessionem, quam per Scripturam exigere oportet, ut fa-
 teantur se cum omni consensu Ecclesiæ catholicæ statuta
 observaturos—si forte Episcopus fuerat, habeat Sacerdotii
 dignitatem: nisi forte placuit catholico Episcopo, concedere
 ei etiam episcopalis nominis honorem, *Magd. Hist. ubi supra.*

‘ to which any of these come, the Catholick Bishop
 ‘ or Presbyter shall have the Dignity ; and if any of
 ‘ those which come off, shall happen to be a Bishop,
 ‘ let him have the *Dignity of the Priesthood*, unless it
 ‘ shall please the Catholick Bishop to grant him the
 ‘ *Honour of the Episcopal Name.*’ So that this Article
 also falls very heavy upon Mr. H’s Cause ; for what can
 affect it more, than for the Council to determine, that
 the *Novatian Hereticks* should be reordain’d ? which
 shows, that no Orders conferred by them were valid,
 but in themselves null and void. Mr. H. will not say,
 that these were *Presbyterian or Entusiastick Hereticks* ;
 nor dare he say, that they had not preserved among
 them the *Succeſſion Episcopal*. And yet we see the Rule
 was, that those ordained by these Hereticks were to be
 reordained, directly contrary to what Mr. H. has af-
 firmed.

For the further Satisfaction of Mr. H’s Reader, I will
 here add what the Council of *Eliberis* in *Spain* decreed
 about the same time as the Council at *Nice*. They for-
 bid ‘ to admit any into the Number of the Clergy who
 ‘ came from the Hereticks ; and ordained, that those
 ‘ who were of the Clergy in time past, should be de-
 ‘ posed (a).’

But to set Mr. H’s Rule in a little clearer light, I will
 add to this what the Council at *Carthage* decreed, with
 famous Father *Cyprian* at their Head. They give us a
 Rule quite contrary to Mr. H’s. It runs thus : ‘ There-
 ‘ fore according to the Testimony of the Scriptures, and
 ‘ according to the Decree of our Collegues, Men of
 ‘ most holy Memory, all *Schismaticks and Hereticks*, who
 ‘ return to the Church, are to be baptized ; also those
 ‘ who seem to be ordained, are to be received as
 ‘ Laicks (b).’ And to this Rule, *Cyprian* says, ‘ We

(a) Ex omni heresi qui ad nos fideles venerit minime est
 ad Clerum promovendus. Vel si qui sunt in præteritum
 ordinati sine dubio deponerentur, *Ibid.* See also Du Pin *Eccles.*
Hist. Cent. iv. of the Council of Eliberis, Can. 51.

(b) Et ideo secundum testimonium Scripturarum, & se-
 cundum decretum collegarum nostrorum, sanctissimæ me-
 moriæ virorum, omnes Schismaticos & Hereticos qui ad
 Ecclesiam conversi sunt, baptizare ; sed & eos qui ordinati
 videbantur inter Laicos recipi, *Conc. Carth. Suffr. iv. p. 230.*
Oxon.

‘ must keep close, we must hold it fast, and not let it go ; ’tis to be observed as a tryed Truth, that all who are converted to the Church from *every Heresy*, are to be baptized with the legitimate or only valid Baptism of the Church, except those, who having been baptized in the Church before, went over to the Hereticks (a).’ And that this Rule was carefully observ’d by the Antients in their Discipline, we have a clear Proof from that *Epistle* which *Cyprian* sent to *Antoninus* ; wherein he endeavours to satisfy him concerning the Report which had reached his Ears, that *Trophimus* was admitted to Communion by Mr. H’s Rule : that is, that he was admitted to his Dignity and Place in the Church as a *Clergyman*, which *St. Cyprian* denies, and acquaints him, that ’twas a false Story raised by the Apostates, and assures him, that *Trophimus* was received only as a *Laick* (b).’

I will conclude this Head with the Determination of a Council, which, as I observed before, seems to be of great weight with Mr. H. I mean that of the Apostles. For the LXVIII Apostolical Canon runs thus : ‘ That he who receives a second Ordination from any one, let him be deprived, and he who ordained him ; unless he can show that his former Ordination was from the Hereticks : for those who are either *baptized or ordained by Hereticks, can neither be Christians nor Clergymen.*’ After this, I presume Mr. H’s Reader will be-

(a) Observatur itaque a nobis & tenetur, carissime frater, explorata & perspecta veritate, ut omnes qui ex quacunque Hæresi ad Ecclesiam convertuntur, Ecclesiæ unico legitimo Baptismo baptizentur, exceptis his, qui baptizati in Ecclesia prius fuerant, & sic ad Hæreticos transierant, *Epist. lxxiv. Oxon. & Pamel. p. 216.*

(b) Sic tamen admissus est Trophimus, ut laicus communicet, non secundum quod ad te malignorum literæ pertrulerunt, quasi locum sacerdotis usurpet, &c. *Epist. lv. Ox. lii. Pamel. And elsewhere, Vel apud Hæreticos e pseudo-episcopis & antichristis contra Christi dispositionem profana ordinatione promoti sunt, & contra altare unum atque divinum sacrificia foris falsa ac sacrilega offerre conati sunt ; eos quoque hac conditione suscipi cum revertuntur, ut communicent laici—Nec debere eos revertentes ea apud nos ordinationis & honoris arma retinere, &c. Epist. lxxii. Oxon. & Pamel.*

lieve

lieve that he was egregiously imposed upon, when he told him, that *of this Antiquity was full, and this was the Rule with the Antients, &c.* He must now see clearly, that the contrary to what Mr. H. boldly affirm'd is the Truth. *Antiquity is full*, 'tis true; but of Instances that make directly against what Mr. H. has asserted.

What Mr. H. says of *Ischyrras* and *Manes*, is nothing to his purpose, for *Manes* never pretended to return, that I can find; and *Ischyrras* was never in Holy Orders, and therefore to talk of his Ordination being esteem'd null and void, is mere trifling. He was indeed a false Witness against *Athanasius*, but never a Presbyter regularly ordain'd. *Eusebius*, *Meletius*, and others, gave him the Name of Presbyter, because no Evidence but a Clergyman's was to be received against a Bishop; but 'tis evident that he was in reality no Clergyman, but a feigned one. They also promised him a Bishoprick, if he would appear against *Athanasius*. 'This *Ischyrras*, ' says *Socrates*, was a Man who had committed a Fact ' worthy of a thousand Deaths. For whereas he had ' never been admitted into Sacred Orders, he took on ' himself the Name of Presbyter. They [*i. e.* the *Eusebian Faction*] in hatred to *Athanasius*, received him ' as a Presbyter, and promised to prefer him to the ' Honour of a Bishoprick, if he would frame an Accu- ' sation against *Athanasius*, &c. (a).' The Centuriators of *Magdeburg* give us much the same Account of this Man. They say, that ' he was never elected Presby- ' ter by the Church, nor was he found in the Number ' of those Presbyters, whom *Alexander* Bishop of *Alex- ' andria* received into the Church, when *Meletius* was ' received, nor created by him (b).' How this Man could be deposed from what he never had, Mr. H. may consider at his leisure.

(a) ἐδὲ πρόποτε ὅς ἱεροσύνης τυχὼν τὸ τῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ ὀνόματι ἐκείνῳ περιβέμενος, τὰ ἱερεῶς πράττειν ἐτόλμις, &c. *Socrat.* lib. i. c. 27.

(b) Presbyter autem, qui fingitur adfuisse, est ille toties rumoribus jactatus Ischyrras, qui neque ab Ecclesia electus est presbyter, neque cum a Meletio constitutos presbyteros Alexander in ecclesiam recipiebat, in eorum numero unquam habitus fuit, aut ab eo creatus. Quo pacto igitur presbyter Ischyrras, aut quo tandem authore constitutus? *Magd. Hist. Cent. iv. c. 9. de Synod.*

Mr. H. goes on: *We confess*, says he, *a Breach of Union, but none of Succession*. This is a very large Concession; for where there is a Breach of Union by *Heresy and Schism*, there is also a Breach of Succession; unless he can prove that this *uninterrupted Succession* may be convey'd by Men out of the Catholick Church. The Heretick and Schismatick *Novatian* separated himself from the Catholick Church, and set up an Altar against *Cornelius*, his lawful Bishop; for this he was excommunicated by *Cornelius* and his Church, and their Sentence was ratify'd by a Council of Bishops. Now he being for his Heresy and Schism cut off from the Communion of the Catholick Church, it lieth on Mr. H. to prove, and that contrary to *Cornelius* and his Council at Rome, and contrary to his celebrated St. *Cyprian*, and his Council at Carthage, that Persons not of the Catholick Church, but Hereticks and Schismatics, can convey down to us the true Apostolick Succession. If uninterrupted Succession must be convey'd down by Persons in the Catholick Church; then those who are not of the Church, but separate from it, can't convey it to us: but the first, according to Mr. H. is true; ergo, the last. If there is no Salvation out of the Catholick Church, as according to Mr. H. there is not; then there can be no true Mission out of the Church: for where there is true Mission, Mr. H. will allow Salvation. Therefore if Salvation require valid Baptism, and valid Baptism require regular Mission, and regular Mission may be had out of the Catholick Church, by those who have no Union with it; then let Mr. H. also allow valid Baptism, and consequently Salvation out of the Catholick Church, by those separated from it, as well as regular Mission; or grant that there is no regular Mission out of the Catholick Church: which is, in short, giving up the Cause. To these Difficulties is Mr. H. now reduced; either to grant what he has once and again strenuously deny'd, viz. that there is any valid Baptism and Salvation out of the Catholick Church; or yield that there is also no true Mission out of the Church: for where there is true Mission, the rest will follow by necessary and unavoidable consequence.

The renown'd Father *Cyprian*, to whose Opinion Mr. H. so readily subscribes, severely condemns what he here asserts. That Mr. H. may not plead Ignorance
of

of what his good Father has said, I will transcribe a Sentence or two for his Perusal. Says he, ' That Man ' that keepeth not the Unity of the Church, has no ' Ecclesiastical Ordination. Whosoever is made after ' one, who ought to be alone, is not a second ; but ' none (a).' Again, ' Whosoever he is, and whatso- ' ever he is, he is no Christian that is not in the Church ' of Christ (b).' Again, ' He that neither keeps the ' Unity of the Spirit, nor the Bond of Peace, and se- ' parates himself from the Church, and the Society of ' Priests, can neither have the Power, nor the Honour ' of a Bishop (c).' And this he speaks of this very *Novatian*, of whom we are treating, who if he had been regularly a Bishop before, by his Schism, he, according to this Father, had forfeited his Power (d).' And in another Epistle he says : ' But likewise other ' Hereticks, who separate themselves from the Church ' of God, can have no Power or Grace, seeing all Au- ' thority and Grace is placed in the Church, where the ' Elders preside, who have the Power of baptizing, ' and laying on of Hands (e).' The *Novatians*, who returned to the Church, were to be baptiz'd (f). Now

(a) Nec habeat ecclesiasticam ordinationem qui Ecclesiæ non tenet unitatem ; — quisquis post unum qui solus esse debeat, factus est ; non jam secundus ille, sed nullus est, *Epist. lv. Oxon. lii. Pamel.*

(b) Quisquis ille est, & qualiscunque est, non Christianus est, qui in Christi Ecclesia non est, *Ibid.*

(c) Qui ergo nec unitatem spiritus, nec conjunctionem pacis observat ; & se ab Ecclesiæ vinculo, atque a sacerdotum collegio separat, Episcopi nec potestatem potest habere, nec honorem, *Ibid.*

(d) Episcopatum autem tenere non posset, etiamsi episcopus prius factus, a coepiscoporum suorum corpore & ab ecclesiæ unitate desciscens, *Ibid.*

(e) Sed & cæteri quique Hæretici, si se ab Ecclesia Dei sciderint, nihil habere potestatis aut gratiæ possunt ; quando omnis potestas & gratia in Ecclesia constituta sit, ubi præsident majores natu, qui & baptizandi & manum imponendi & ordinandi possident potestatem, *Epist. lxxv. Oxon. & Pamel.*

(f) Cyprian's *Epistle to Jubianus*, Ep. lxxiii. Oxon. & Pamel.

if
inv
the
An
me
rec
cre
fam
Dio
con
Bre
Bre
mu
mai
unin
M
Ordi
bad
of i
in te
H's
whic
thar
Sch
of th
he,
show
Bisbo
the
shop
Task
Reac
Bishe
wher
rious
says,
and
and
were
(the
Chur

if their Baptism was corrupt, and esteem'd as null and invalid, of consequence all their Orders; for where there are valid Orders, there must be valid Baptism. And this was not *Cyprian's* Opinion alone, but the Judgment of a whole Synod of *African Bishops* (a), and that received from their Predecessors; and this Synod's Decrees were confirmed by another Synod after in the same place: and Dr. *Echard* tells us, *That Firmilian and Dionysius were of the same mind.* From all which I conclude against Mr. *H.* that a Breach of Union is a Breach of Succession: and seeing Mr. *H.* has granted a Breach of Union by the *Novatians*, thro them also there must be a Breach of Succession, which is the thing we maintain; and from a broken Line we can never have uninterrupted Succession.

Mr. *H.* says, *The Irregularity of Novatian's Life and Ordination, our Author knows affects not the Cause; but he had a mind to tell a foul Story, and he has had the Pleasure of it.* I answer; The greatest Pleasure I have received in telling this Story, is, now to see that it affects Mr. *H's* Cause so much, that he can never heal the Wound which this *foul Story* has given it, unless he can show that the Baptism and Ordination of Hereticks and Schismaticks out of the Church, contrary to the Canons of the Church, are valid. Mr. *H.* goes on: *Had he, says he, consulted Conscience, as well as Spleen, he would have shown the Severity with which the Church used the ordaining Bishops.* In telling this Story, I had nothing to do with the Severity of the Church against those ordaining Bishops; but since Mr. *H.* has thought good to put this Task upon me, I will take notice of it, and tell the Reader the remaining part of the Story. Those three Bishops, who in secret, at ten a clock at night, and when they were drunk, ordained *Novatian*, that notorious Heresiarch and Schismatick, were, as the Story says, *simple, ignorant Men*, unacquainted with the Wiles and Stratagems of that crafty and wicked Heretick: and for this their wicked and irregular Practice, they were *deposed, and excommunicated*; and one of them (the *simplest*, I suppose) not long after returned to the Church, bewailing and confessing his Sin, and having

(a) Ep. lxx. Oxon. & Pamel.

done Penance, by the Intercession of the People, he was by the Pope admitted to Lay Communion. Thus writes *Cornelius* to *Fabian* of *Antioch* (a). I will only remark on this part of the Story, that *Novatian's* Ordination was irregular, and contrary to the *Canons* of the Church; and hence desire Mr. H. in his next Considerations, to prove that those three drunken, ignorant Bishops, by this their irregular Imposition of their Hands upon *Novatian's* Heretical and Schismatical Head, did imprint such an indelible Character, that his Schism and Heresy could not rase out. Let him oblige the World with his Demonstrations, that the Ordination was good and valid to *Novatian*, which those three Bishops were deposed and excommunicated for conferring. When Mr. H. has done this, he will have done something to solve these Difficulties; but till this is done, *Novatian's* irregular Life and Ordination will appear to render uninterrupted Succession impossible thro the Church of Rome. For this Heretical and Schismatical Ordination being null and void in itself, of consequence all Ordination and Baptism, which proceeded from it, are all invalid; and yet afterwards infinite Numbers were by him and his Adherents both ordained and baptized, and all received in without either Reordination or Rebaptization, contrary to the antient and known Rules and Canons of the Church, and Decrees of Councils, as we have above abundantly proved.

What therefore Mr. H. says, that I represent as a Principle of the Catholick Church, or of the Church of Rome at that time, or of the Church of England, that Heretical and Schismatical Baptisms, &c. were invalid, where there are Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, who have broke off from the Church, is his Mistake. I represented that those Hereticks and Schismaticks were excommunicated by the Church, and condemned by the Council; and yet, contrary to the antient Rule, and to Mr. H's and his Brethrens own avowed Principle (*i. e.* that Persons receiving Lay Baptism, or heretically and schismatically baptized or ordained, cannot receive, much less convey, valid Mission) were received into the Church without Rebaptization or Reordination; and consequently

(a) Euseb. Eccles. Hist. lib. vi. c. 43.

all Baptisms and Ordinations from these must be invalid: and the Church of *Rome* being full of such from these Schismatics, and now not to be known from those who were regularly baptized and ordained, 'tis impossible to have any Certainty of uninterrupted Succession from the Church at *Rome*. Mr. *H.* should here have proved, that the Baptism and Ordination of Hereticks and Schismatics were in themselves valid, and have shown, that tho they were excommunicated, and cut off from the Catholick Church; yet by Scripture, and the Rule of the antient Church, they could receive and convey, out of the Church, uninterrupted Orders of Ministry for the Church. If Mr. *H.* had done this, he had gone a great way towards satisfying his judicious Reader, who considers the Importance of what he reads.

Mr. *H.* says, *Our Succession cannot be broke by Supposition.* I answer, True; but Fact of Heresy and Schism notoriously proved and condemned, will break the Succession: and such was the Heresy and Schism of *Novatian*, and his Adherents, who were excommunicated by the Church, and the Sentence of the Church was approved as just by the Catholick Church, who gave *Cornelius* Letters of Communion. Moreover, he and his Party were condemned by a Council called at *Rome*.

As to the Case of Simony, Mr. *H.* says, *Simony will not hurt without such Proof. Such Proof!* What Proof? that, Mr. *H.* 'tis like, will explain in his next. But he adds, *He ought not therefore to have contented himself with saying, that the Succession may be broke by Simony; but to have shown us some Person, or Persons, guilty of it, convicted and censured for it, who yet notwithstanding ordain'd, &c.* What was asserted by me, was back'd with Proof from the learned Dr. *Whitby*; tho Mr. *H.* according to custom, seems to call for Proof, as tho none had been before produced. The Doctor acquaints us, 'that this
' *curfed Simony* was notoriously practised in the *Roman*
' Church from the ninth to the sixteenth Century. And
' in this time, Simony so prevailed, that Bishopricks
' were sold publickly; and that he had them, who
' who gave most for them; and that all Ecclesiastical
' Degrees, even from the Popedom to the Doorkeep-
' ers, were oppressed with damnable *Simony*; and that

‘ this *spiritual Robbery* obtained in all Places. Seeing
 ‘ then, says he, the Ordinations of Popes, Bishops, and
 ‘ Presbyters in the Church of Rome, for six hundred
 ‘ Years, were very frequently Simoniackal, and so con-
 ‘ ferred upon them no Sacerdotal Power, and so could
 ‘ give no Authority to confer this Power on others ;
 ‘ hence it necessarily follows, that at the beginning of
 ‘ the Reformation, it is utterly uncertain, whether there
 ‘ were any Bishops in that Church, or who those Bi-
 ‘ shops and Priests were.’ This, and more, was said in
 my *Sermon*, p. 63. and is it not strange that Mr. H. af-
 ter this, should call for Proof? But if he must have
 Instances of this *curfed Simony* prevailing in the Church
 of Rome, to help him, I will point to him a few of
 those many who were notoriously guilty.

Pope *Formosus* obtained the Papal Throne by *Simony*,
 when opposition was made against him by some (a).

Pope *Stephen VI.* dug up the Body of his Predecessor
Formosus, and try’d him for Heresy ; and having con-
 victed him, cut off three Fingers of his Right Hand,
 wherewith he used to give Blessing, and consecrate ;
 and disrobed him of his Pontifical Habit, and cast him
 into the Tyber (b). The *Great Historical, Geographical*
Dictionary says, that he shew’d this Barbarity to *For-*
mosus’s Body, because by his *Simony* he had prevented his
 Advancement to the Popedom before (c) ; tho he him-
 self, according to *Platina*, was guilty of the same
 Crime: for it was come to that pass, that Men now
 obtained the Popedom by *Briberies*.

Pope *Sergius III.* was such an Enemy to *Formosus* the
 Heretick, that he would not suffer any ordain’d by him
 to officiate until they were reordain’d. In his Life *Pla-*
tina complains, that the Popedom was sought by Am-
 bition and Bribery, and when they had obtain’d it,
 they raged like cruel Tyrants against one another (d.)

(a) Ad Pontificatum non ita multo post, largitione po-
 tius quam virtute, contradicentibus quibusdam assumitur,
Plat. in vita Formosi. (b) *Plat. in vita Stephani vi.*

(c) In the Word *Formosus*. Et largitionibus pontificium
 munus obirent, *Plat. in vita Stephani.*

(d) Hi vero largitione & ambitione pontificatum quæren-
 tes & adepti, posthabito divino cultu, inimicitias non secus
 ac sævissimi quidam tyranni inter sese exercebant, *Plat. in*
vita Sergii.

Pope *Benedictus IX.* was so notoriously wicked, that he sold his Popedom to *Gregory VI.* and to be sure *Gregory* must be guilty of *Simony* in purchasing of it; and Pope *Sylvester* at the same time contested it with them both. These three *Platina* calls *Monsters of Popes*, whom *Henry II.* calling a Council, deposed all at once, for their *Corruption and notorious Bribery (a).*

Pope *Boniface VIII.* obtain'd the *Pontificate* by the same corrupt and unlawful Means, having suborned some to prevail with Pope *Celestine* to surrender the Popedom to him, which he did (b). He was so inflamed with Ambition and vehement Desire of the Pontificate, that he spared no pains, left no stone unturn'd to gratify his ambitious Desire. He was resolved to have it, *per fas aut nefas*; and after he had obtained the Papal Throne, he acted as tyrannical and openly vicious, as before with Subtilty and Craft. *Philip*, King of *France*, convicted him in open Parliament of *Simony*, Murder, Atheism, Usury, Adultery, and also of a Secret League with the *Saracens*. This Man is one of Mr. *H's* Successors of *St. Peter*, who must convey to us the Sacred Orders: a Devil incarnate. Can any Protestant depend upon any Sacred Thing convey'd by this Monster of Impiety? God forbid! For more of the Man, I refer the *English* Reader to the *Great Historical, Geographical Dictionary*, on the word *Boniface VIII.*

(a) Has ob res Henricus secundus in Italiam cum magno exercitu veniens, & habita synodo cum Benedictum nonum, Sylvestrem tertium, Gregorium sextum, tanquam tria teterrima monstra abdicare se magistratu coegisset, *Plat. in vita Greg. vi.*

(b) Adeo dignitatem pontificatus exoptavit, ut nil ambitione & fraude prætermiserit, quod ad eam rem consequendam pertinere arbitraretur, tantæ præterea arrogantiae fuit, ut & fere omnes contemneret—Quod contra jus, fasque pontificatus sedem occupasset, rejeo fraudibus Cælestino eodemque in carcerem conjecto—Interim vero Philippus rex Franciæ, Bonifacii arrogantiam iniquo animo ferens, habito apud Parisios ecclesiasticorum & nobilium magno conventu, commemoartisque injuriis a Bonifacio acceptis, ejusque ambitione & malis artibus ad occupandum pontificatum, quem injuste teneret, ad sedem apostolicam tum, ut ipse dicebat, vacantem, futurumque concilium appellavit, *Plat. de vita Bonifacii viii.*

Pope Boniface IX. is accused also of dishonouring his Pontificate, by making Merchandize of all manner of Places at the Court of Rome, and of Tyranny, Simony, Idolatry, and selling of Benefices to those who bid most for them (a).

Alexander VI. is reported to have obtained the Popedom by his Bribery, and was so notorious a *Simoniack*, that he made sport of selling Benefices, and usurping the Rents and Lands which belonged to them, and frequently put those to death who blamed his Extravagancies. He was publickly lampoon'd for this Villany in these particular Verses, thus :

*Vendit Alexander claves, altaria, Christum
Vendere jure potest, emerat ille prius.
Sextus Tarquinius, Sextus Nero, Sextus & ipse ;
Semper sub Sextis perdita Roma fuit (b).*

To his *Simony* he added Cruelty and Murder, and some say, *Incest* too. He cut off most of those he had corrupted to advance him to the Papal Chair. At length having a Design to poison certain Cardinals, by mistake was himself, by the just Hand of God, poison'd with the same Dose he design'd for them. This is a goodly Conveyer of uninterrupted Orders ! How glorious and desirable must that Succession be, convey'd by the hands of such Men as these ! One would think that a Protestant should be ashamed to claim any relation to

(a) *Historical, Geographical Dictionary on Boniface ix. which is confirm'd by Platina.* Multa enim crimina per Simoniacam pravitatem committebantur, petentibus contra jus fasque omnia tum fratribus, tum cognatis ; quorum magna multitudo quæstus gratia Romam venerat, indulgentiæ vero & quidem plenariæ ita passim vendebantur, ut jam vilesceret clavium & literarum apostolicarum autoritas.

(b) *Hist. Geograph. Dictionary on the Word Alexander vi.* Nonnullorum autem cardinalium cæca ambitione & avaritia corruptorum opera, tantam dignitatem assecutus esse dicitur, qui postea in ingrato pontifice perfidiam maximam experti, debitas scelerati studii venalisque suffragii pœnas dedere. Horum princeps fuit Ascanius Sfortia emptus procul dubio profusissima largitione, ut hic omnium ejus ordinis deterrimus, *Onuphr. de vita Alexand. vi.*

these

these Devils incarnate; much less think that his Orders are invalid, unless transmitted to him thro their impure and wicked Hands.

Of this sort many more Instances may be produced, not inferior to these now mentioned; but I suppose these may be sufficient to satisfy any reasonable Man, that what Dr. *Whitby* asserted is easy to be proved. If any Man is desirous to see more Instances, he may read *Platina*, *Onuphrius*, and *Baronius* himself, and he will quickly be convinced, that this *curfed Simony* very much prevailed heretofore, if it is not at this day practised in the Church of *Rome*. The *English* Reader may find a glorious Collection of *Peter's* Successors, from whom we are to derive our Succession, in the Curate of *Wilts* his *Letter to the Reverend Dr. Snape*, printed in the Year 1718. The Fact being thus proved, the Consequence which Dr. *Whitby* made, before mentioned, is good: 'All Simoniackal Ordination being *ipso facto* null and void, no Sacerdotal Power could be given or received by any Simoniack; and such Ordinations being frequent in the Church of *Rome*, no Succession from them can be certain.'

To this of Dr. *Whitby*, I will add the Judgment of the learned Dr. *Barrow*. 'There is one Heresy, says he, of which, if all Histories do not lye grievously, divers Popes have been guilty; a Heresy defin'd by divers Popes, the Heresy of Simony. How many such Hereticks have sate in that Chair? Of which how many Popes are proclaimed guilty with a loud Voice in History? Yea, how few, for some Ages, have been guiltless of this Heresy? It may be answer'd, they were no Popes, because their Election was null; but then the Church hath often and long been without a Head. Then numberless Acts have been void, and Creation of Cardinals have been null; and consequently there hath not probably been any true Pope for a long time (a).'

Tho these Authorities might be sufficient to convince any Man, except Mr. *H*. that this *curfed Simony* renders all Orders invalid, which are procured thereby; yet to procure Mr. *H's* Assent to so great a Truth, I will add

(a) Pope's Supremacy, p. 737. fol. vol. 1.

one Authority more, which perhaps may affect his Conscience more than all. If Mr. H. will read over again, or call to mind the *Apostolical Canons*, he will find that the XXX Canon says, that 'If any Bishop obtains that Dignity by Money, or even a Presbyter or Deacon; let him, and he that ordained him, be deprived, and let him be entirely cut off from Communion, as *Simon Magus* was by me *Peter*.'

Thus having proved, that *Herefy*, *Schism*, and *Simony*, have so divided the Line in that Church, that 'tis now impossible to find out the right Line from the wrong; I might proceed to what is further said by Mr. H. But first I will add, *ex abundanti*, one Argument more, which I omitted in my *Sermon*, but which I conceive is as cogent as any, to show that the Line is broke in the Church of *Rome*; and that is, *Lay Deprivations of Bishops and Popes*. 'Tis no Secret to Mr. H. what noise this has made in this Kingdom, within the Memory of some yet living. Now if Lay Deprivation with Mr. H. is invalid, and no Man, or Set of Men, by any Lay Power under Heaven, can deprive an Ecclesiastick of his Benefice; if the Bishopricks of those deprived by Lay Powers are still full; those Bishops supposed to be deprived, retaining still their Right *Jure Divino*: those supposed Bishops, who by the Lay Power are fet in their places, are in reality *no Bishops*, and consequently all their Acts, and the Acts of their Successors, are invalid. 'Tis not my Business to meddle with the Right of Lay Powers to deprive Ecclesiasticks, or to assert the Validity or Invalidity thereof; but only to argue upon allowed Principles. I shall therefore, for Argument's sake, suppose Lay Deprivation invalid; and upon this Consideration, according to our highflying Notions, there can be no Certainty of any uninterrupted Succession from *Rome*: for many Popes have been deprived by Lay Powers; but if they were Bishops *Jure Divino*, no Lay Power had Right to deprive them of what they had by such a superior Right. Consequently all those Bishops, who filled the Sees of the Bishops deprived by Lay Power, were Usurpers, and all their Consecrations null and void. This will not only render all Succession in the Church at *Rome* precarious and uncertain, but even all Ordinations at *home* too, allowing the Succession uninterrupted to the Reformation. Those

Bishops

Bishops, who were set in the Places of those *deprived* either by King *Henry VIII.* King *Edward VI.* Queen *Mary,* or Queen *Elizabeth* (not to mention the Deprivations since that time) were all Usurpers, and had no Right, while the Sees were full by *Divine Right.* For where there is one in a Chair, there is no second. For, says a late famous (a) Writer, 'It was a Principle [and 'I may say it is still of some] universally received in 'the Catholick Church, as antient as the Practice of 'two pretending to the same Bishoprick, that the *Secundus* was always looked on as *Nullus foras alienus* ; so 'far from being a Bishop of a Church, that the Attempt divided him from it. And this is, says he, 'as evident from Reason as from Authority, because 'no Man can convey the same thing twice ; and therefore in all Monarchical Districts, none can suppose an 'Anti-Monarch's Title good, till he has shown the 'first Monarch's Title is not so.' This must make the Consecration of Protestant Bishops for those Sees, which were full of others, null and void. And if the Protestants were not Bishops, but Usurpers of the Sees of others, who still retain'd their Right *Jure Divino* ; what Protestant Rector can now be sure of his valid Orders ? And if not, according to Mr. H's Notion, all his Acts and Administrations are invalid, and his People in a miserable, hopeless Condition without valid Baptism, and consequently out of the Church, and without Hope of Salvation. Good God ! what a deplorable Condition are we Protestants in, if God hath made this uninterrupted Succession (so very precarious and uncertain ; nay, thus impossible to be had) a thing necessary to the Salvation of our Souls ! But blessed be God, he hath not thus done. This is only a *Chimera* of Men's Brains.

But should we grant all before, and if we could find out the right Line, and trace it up to the Head ; there we shall be in eternal Confusion, 'tis so very uncertain whom the Apostles ordained, if any one. Why did not Mr. H. prove by authentick History, whom 'twas in particular that the Apostle *Peter* laid his Hands on ? In short, 'twas because he could not. And therefore

(a) Vindication of the Defence of the deprived Bishops, cited by the Rights of the Christian Church, p. 328. Edit. 4.

he contents himself with only suggesting, that Bishop *Pearson* and Mr. *Dodwell* had somewhere or other clear'd the Succession against the Efforts of *Blondel*. But why had not Mr. *H.* produced his Author's Words, if he had not Proofs of his own? He ventures however to tell his Reader, *that Linus was first, Anacletus second, and Clemens third.* If his Reader will take his bare Word, without Proof, he may; nay, he must: for he has none to bring, that can be depended upon. Indeed, this matter is so very *uncertain*, no body can tell whom to believe, the Evidences clash, and vary so much among themselves. The Reader will be better able to form a Judgment of the Certainty or Uncertainty of this Succession, when he has view'd the several Proofs. Mr. *H.* says, *Linus was first, Anacletus second, and Clemens third.* For this Opinion is commonly urged the Testimony of *Irenæus*, 'That the blessed Apostles deliver'd the Ministry to *Linus* (a).' As to this Witness, 1. He does not say that the Apostles *ordained Linus*; but only *deliver'd the Publick Ministry of the Church to Linus.* 2. This is a Report of his near an hundred Years after. 3. *Irenæus* don't say, that the Apostle *Peter* ordained him, but the Apostles in general; as if he was in doubt, or did not know which. Thus uncertain is this Evidence in itself. But to render it more doubtful, the *Apostolical Constitutions* say thus: 'Of the Church of *Rome, Linus, the Son of Claudia, was the first ordain'd by Paul* (b).' Contrary to *Irenæus*, who says, that the blessed Apostles deliver'd the Ministry to *Linus.* But that which destroys what both these Evidences say, is, what *Eusebius* relates concerning *Linus*, the first Bishop of *Rome.* Says he, 'After the Martyrdom of *Peter* and *Paul, Linus* was first chosen by Lot to the Bishoprick of *Rome* (c).' Here one says, the blessed Apostles deliver'd the Ministry to *Linus*; another, that *Paul* ordain'd *Linus* first; a third, that neither is true, for after the Martyrdom of *Peter* and *Paul*, he was chosen to the Bishoprick by Lot. Now if he was chosen after

(a) 'Οι μακάριοι ἀπόστολοι Λίνω τὴν ᾗ ἐπισκοπῆς λειτουργίαν ἐνεχέρεσαν, Euseb. Eccles. Hist. lib. v. c. 6.

(b) Apost. Constitut. lib. vii. c. 46. Edit. Whist.

(c) Τῆς ᾗ Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίας μετὰ τὴν Παύλου καὶ Πέτρος μαρτυρίαν, πρῶτος κληρῆται τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν Λίνος, Euseb. Hist. lib. 3. c. 2.

the Death of *Peter* and *Paul*, then he could not be ordain'd by them in their Life time. Let Mr. *H.* now reconcile these jarring Relations, and shew how *Linus* could be chosen to the Bishoprick after the Apostles *Paul* and *Peter* were dead, and yet invested by them before. Mr. *H.* says, *Anacletus* was second, and *Clemens* third. But the *Apostolical Constitutions* say, that *Clemens* was second after *Linus's* Death. *Epiphanius* says, *Linus* was first, and *Cletus* second, and *Clemens* succeeded *Cletus*, and mentions no *Anacletus* (a). Mr. *H.* says, *Linus* was first; but *Tertullian* says, *Clemens* was first after *Peter* (b). And *Clemens* himself, in his *Epistle to James*, says, that *Peter* himself ordained him Bishop of Rome (c). Now if *Peter* ordained *Clemens* himself, then he could not deliver the Bishoprick to *Linus*, contrary to *Irenæus*. If *Peter* ordained *Clemens* first, then *Linus* could not be ordained first by *Paul*, contrary to the *Apostolick Constitutions*. If *Peter* ordained *Clemens*, this is contrary to what Dr. *Echard* says in this case, viz. that *Linus* succeeded *Peter*, and *Clemens* St. *Paul*; for if *Peter* ordained *Clemens*, *Clemens* must succeed him, and not St. *Paul*. If *Peter* ordained *Clemens*, then he could not ordain *Linus* too at the same time to be Bishop of the same Church; or else, contrary to Rule, *Peter* must put two Bishops in one Chair at the same time.

To make this uninterrupted Succession plain and clear, Mr. *H.* must again put on his considering Cap, in order to reconcile these different Relations of this Matter, and not think it sufficient to refer his Readers to what others have said, when 'twas ever doubtful, and ever will be. If *Eusebius*, that great and early Historian, found it hard and difficult to tell who were the certain and undoubted Successors of the Apostles, 'tis not very likely to be made clear in our day, when we must have it for the most part from his uncertain Stories and Reports. Says *Eusebius* himself, 'Tis hard to

(a) *Epiphan. Hæres.* 27.

(b) *Romanorum ecclesiæ Clementem a Petro ordinatum esse, Tertull. de Pref.* 32.

(c) *Nunc Clementem episcopum vobis ordino, Willet Synops. Papism. p.* 68. *Edit.* 3. 1600.

‘ say who were the certain Successors of the Apostles (a).’ We know common Fame is a Lyar, and not to be trusted for matters of moment in our own day, much less a Report, when it has run thro two or three hundred Years after things are done. The *Cen-
turiators* did not find this so clear in their Searches into Antiquity, who say ; ‘ Concerning *Linus*, and *Cletus*, and ‘ *Anacletus*, who are reckon’d in the number of the ‘ *Roman Bishops* after *Peter*, there is so great a diver-
sity, that ’tis not possible to explain or reconcile it (b).’ Dr. *Eckard* likewise after taking so much pains and sweat to reconcile these different Accounts, leaves it to his Reader as dubious as he found it. Says he, ‘ *Cletus*, ‘ or *Anacletus* [one of the two, but uncertain which] in the ‘ beginning of 92, or the latter end of 91, suffered ‘ Martyrdom, after he had been Bishop of Rome 12 ‘ Years ; he was succeeded by the famous *Clement*— ‘ who is frequently called the third Bishop of Rome af- ‘ ter *Peter*, yet with no little Uncertainty : for many are ‘ of opinion, that before the Death of *Peter* and *Paul*, ‘ the Church at Rome was divided into two *Cætus*, or ‘ Companies, the one consisting of *Jewish* Converts un- ‘ der St. *Peter*, and the other of *Gentile* Converts ‘ under St. *Paul* ; and upon their Deaths, *Linus* suc- ‘ ceeded *Peter*, and *Clement* St. *Paul* : but after the ‘ Distinction of *Jew* and *Gentile* failed, upon the Death ‘ of *Cletus*, both the *Cætus*, or Churches, coalesced under ‘ the surviving Bishop *Clemens* ; so that in that sense he ‘ may be called the third Bishop of Rome after the A- ‘ postles : and tho this Opinion is doubted, and deny’d ‘ by some, especially the *Romanists* ; yet it is plain, ‘ that nothing will so well solve the different Accounts of ‘ the first Bishops of Rome (c).’ Thus he. And Bi-
shop *Stillingfleet*, that great and learned Antiquary, after all his diligent and judicious Search into Antiquity, gives us his Thoughts of this matter very frankly, and they are worth transcribing. Says he, ‘ Come we there-

(a) ’Ου ῥέδιον ἔπεν, Euseb. Hist. lib. iii. c. 4.

(b) De Lino, & Cleto, & Anacleto, qui in catalogis Romanorum Episcoporum post Petrum numerantur, tanta est diversitas, ut explicari aut reconciliari fere quocunque negotio nequeat, Magd. Hist. Cent. i. lib. ii. c. 10. de Episc. Rom.

(c) Ecclesiast. Hist. lib. ii. c. 8. p. 273.

fore to *Rome*, and here the Succession is as muddy as
 the *Tiber* itself; for here *Tertullian*, *Rufinus*, and se-
 veral others, place *Clemens* next to *Peter* [quite con-
 trary to *Mr. H.*] *Irenæus* and *Eusebius* set *Anacletus* be-
 fore him [as *Mr. H.* has done] *Epiphanius* and *Opta-*
tus, both *Anacletus* and *Cletus*; *Augustinus* and *Damasus*,
 with others, make *Anacletus*, and *Cletus*, and *Linus*,
 all to precede him. What way shall we find to extri-
 cate ourselves out of this Labyrinth, so as to reconcile
 it with the Certainty of the Form of Government in
 the Apostles times? Certainly, if the Line of Succef-
 sion fail us here [as it certainly does] when we most
 need it, we have little cause to pin our Faith upon it,
 as to the Certainty of any particular Form of Church
 Government, settled in the Apostles Times, which can
 be drawn from the help of the Records of the Primitive
 Church; which must be first cleared of all Defective-
 ness, Ambiguity, Partiality, and Confusion, before the
 thing we enquire for can be extracted out of them (a).
 Can any one now persuade himself, that this Matter is
 so very clear, after all these Confessions of so many lear-
 ned Men to the contrary, and when so learned a Prelate
 as Bishop *Stillington* has found it as muddy as the *Tiber*
itself? O glorious Succession! How clear and bright
 dost thou shine forth to thy Admirers! As clear as the
 Sun envelop'd in a thick Cloud at Noonday. I shall
 therefore leave *Mr. H.* this Task, to extricate his Suc-
 cession from this Labyrinth, and make it clear, that the
 Line is whole, and not broken by *Heresies*, *Schisms*, *Simony*,
Lay Deprivations, nor *Lay Baptism*, and that there is
 no doubt, but all the Succession is clear from *Peter*,
 thro the Church of *Rome*, to this day; which is now,
 and will remain (unless he clear it up) so dubious and
 precarious, that no wise Man can persuade himself to
 believe, that the Allwise God would hang the Peace
 and Quiet, much less the eternal Salvation, of his Peo-
 ple's Souls, on such a thing as none, no not the wisest
 of Men, with all their Advantages of human Litera-
 ture, can have any Certainty of.

In p. 44. *Mr. H.* says, I arraign the Succession asserted, as
 uncertain, and impossible, and therefore what God would ne-

(a) *Irenic. par. ii. c. 6. p. 322. Edit. 2.*

ver make the Instrument of our Salvation. True; and I have now abundantly proved it to be not only uncertain, but impossible, and what can never be proved, and again desire Mr. H. to undertake it. And *as the Source of all Papal Errors.* To this likewise we plead guilty, and are not, by Mr. H. convinced of any Error or Evil committed therein. And, it seems, I add further, 'Tis impossible, because it may fail. This, says he, *shall be its own Confutation.* Here Mr. H. hath wronged his Antagonist. I did not represent uninterrupted Succession as impossible, because it may fail, but because it had already fail'd in several Particulars; because the Line was so miserably broken to pieces, by *Lay Baptisms, Heresies, Schisms, Simony,* and I now add by *Lay Deprivations,* that 'tis impossible for any uninterrupted Succession to be had thro Rome; and therefore 'twas not rational, much less christian, to believe that our good and gracious God would make the eternal Welfare of his Childrens Souls to depend on this uncertain and impossible thing. Mr. H. might have taken notice, that I sometimes, in the argumentative part of my *Sermon*, argued from the *Uncertainty*, and sometimes from the *Impossibility* of the thing; and in that Page referred to, I was making Application of what was before proved not only *precarious* and *uncertain*, but *impossible.* But Mr. H. goes on to acquaint his Reader, that if this uninterrupted Succession was so precarious and uncertain as represented, the same might have been alledged against the *Aaronical Succession.* With all my heart, I see no Evil in saying so; it affects me not at all, tho it does Mr. H. if true. The Succession of the *Aaronical Priesthood* was often interrupted, and yet the Administrations of the Priests were not render'd invalid; for the Validity of their Administrations did not depend on the Regularity of their Succession. For when *Solomon* deposed *Abiathar*, and set up *Zadock*; and when *Eli*, of the House of *Itamar*, the younger Brother, was preferred to the Priesthood, out of course, their Administrations were not esteemed invalid. Nor were the Priests Administrations invalid in our Saviour's Days, tho there had been several Interruptions and Chasms in the Succession; for if their Administrations had been invalid, our Blessed Lord would not have join'd with them therein. From hence now I reason, that if the Breaches made

in the regular Succession of the *Aaronical* Priesthood, which was instituted by God himself, did not render the Administrations of the succeeding Priests invalid, much less do the Breaches in the Succession of Priests never instituted of God, but of human Invention. If the Validity of the *Jewish* Priests Administrations had depended on their uninterrupted Succession from *Aaron*, as Mr. *H.* pleads, then indeed they might have said as Mr. *H.* suggests; but the Validity of their Administrations did not depend thereon, therefore there can be no such Plea. That there were divers Interruptions in that Priesthood, is evident not only from what is said before, but what we find in *Josephus*, that *Antiochus* chopt and chang'd the High Priest at his pleasure, and the *Romans* and *Herod* put out and in the High Priest as they would, and as they apprehended it was for their Interest. I form this Argument for Mr. *H.* to answer in his next, from this his *Aaronical* Priesthood. If uninterrupted Succession was not absolutely necessary to render the Administrations of the *Aaronical* Priesthood *valid* to the *Jews*; then uninterrupted Succession is not absolutely necessary to render the Administrations of Gospel Ministers valid: but the first is evident, and therefore the last must be true. If, contrary to the Word of God, Men will make that absolutely necessary, which God hath no where commanded, 'tis the way to involve themselves in a Labyrinth of Errors, from which they will never be able to extricate themselves. Good God! what Fears and Doubts will rise in Mens Minds; what Uncertainty will Men be at in all religious Ordinances, if the Validity of all the Priests Administrations for the Salvation of their Souls depend (according to Mr. *H.*'s Notion) upon absolute uninterrupted Succession of Bishops regularly ordain'd from the Apostles? For one irregular Baptism, one irregular Ordination, one Heretical, Schismatical, Simoniacal Bishop, or but one Bishop deposed by the Lay Power, will render all the Administrations of Successors invalid, and there is no Remedy for us Protestants, unless we will be, again, so complaisant to the Pope, as to desire that his Holiness will (as Mr. *H.* says Pope *Paul* and Cardinal *Pool* did) send a Dispensation to render all our Schismatical Orders valid.

In p. 45. Mr. H. is become so courteous as to give his Antagonist good Advice. Says he, *If our Author is in earnest against Popery, I'll venture to tell him, he takes a preposterous way to destroy it. Let him attack it with calm Passions, a cool Head, and strong Reasons. To calumniate, is to lose his own Credit, and not to blast hers.* For this Advice I thank him, and to encourage him to persevere in doing this good Office, I assure him, I will endeavour to put it in practice. And before I proceed, I will desire Mr. H. to consider the Answer which the young Crab, in the Fable, gave her Dam, when she advised her to go forward, and herself went backward, *I præ, sequar.* I hope Mr. H. for the future, will act agreeable to the Advice he gives me. How he has put his own Advice in practice hitherto, I will leave to his Reader to judge. He says, *To call that which is good and sound Popish, is to promote the Reputation of a Party.* To this I agree; and if Mr. H. applies this to me, I deny that I have called any thing good and sound Popish: and if he can shew me any one thing that is good and sound, which I have called Popish, I will give him all reasonable Satisfaction. What is really Popish, I hope Mr. H. will allow me to call by its right Name; and if the Notion of *uninterrupted Succession of regular Ordination, derived from the Apostle Peter, being absolutely necessary to render all Gospel Ministers Mission valid,* is not Popish, I know not what is. I am sure 'tis what the Papists of the Church at Rome assert; and the want of it is what they object against all Protestant Ministers Mission in general, and against the Mission of the Bishops and Priests of the Church of *England* in particular. Now if any Protestant Minister entertain and assert the same thing (tho 'tis a Contradiction to his own Mission) I hope 'tis still just to call it by its right Name. For 'tis not a Protestant Doctrine, tho some few under the Protestant Name, to maintain and uphold a particular Party, have of late Years asserted it. The Protestant Churches and Ministers in general disclaim any such Doctrine; and 'tis to be lamented, that any Protestants should assert and strenuously contend for what is purely Popish, and what will in its Consequences destroy their own Mission, and render all their Administrations invalid, and, if true, their own Salvation dubious, if not their Damnation certain. But as we have noted above,

from

from the true Protestant Bishop of Bangor, we may comfort ourselves, however some, under a Protestant Vizard, join with the Romanists in asserting this thing, *It can never be proved, for God hath not left any Proof of the least Probability, or moral Possibility, of a regular uninterrupted Succession; but a great Appearance, and, humanly speaking, a Certainty of the contrary, that this Succession has been often interrupted.* And therefore Mr. H. will find, 'tis not so easy to prove the popular Scheme, as he terms it, to be the *Daughter of Pride, Usurpation, and Conceit, or the Mother of Tumult and Innovation*; as 'tis to prove, that this Notion of uninterrupted Succession, &c. is truly Popish, and the Source of a World of Iniquity, practised by the Priests of the Roman Church: especially their Domination, and Lording it over the Laity, their demanding Exemption from the Power of the Civil Magistrate, their claiming Authority to dispense with the Word of God, to indulge Men in their Sins, contrary to the Word of God, to dispose of Crowns and Kingdoms, in a word, to open and shut the Gates of Heaven to, or against whom they please. What Consequences Mr. H. fancies will follow on this Head, proceed from his false Apprehensions of the *popular Scheme*. But if these are the Consequences, if this *popular Scheme* is true; according to Mr. H's own Rule, p. 34. *No Inconvenience should prejudicate it: nor should we dislike it, for the Consequences, we fancy, may follow thereon.*

We have proved, against all Mr. H's Cavils, that the faithful in Christ have a Right to chuse their own Ministers. But Mr. H. would persuade his credulous Reader, that we assert what we do not, *viz. that a giddy, bo, rebellious, heretical, highminded People may, to please their Fancies, or Humours, discharge a dozen of their Teachers in a Year, &c.* This is Mr. H's base and unworthy Insinuation. We assert no such lawless Liberty, nor are we Patrons for Anarchy, or Confusion; but to have all things done decently, and in order. We say, that the Power of chusing is in the faithful People, or the Church; but then we also say, that their Choice is under the Direction of the Eldership. We assert, that the Elders are to preside, approve, and give their Suffrage in the Choice. We say also, that when Bishops are thus approved, and elected, that they are to

be solemnly and regularly set apart by Fasting and Prayer, according to the Examples in the Word of God, and with Imposition of the Hands of the Presbytery. And when Ministers, or Bishops, are thus consecrated, that then they are the Rulers and Governors of their several Congregations, or Churches, and are to be obey'd by their People, according to the Command of the Apostle: *Obey them that have the Rule over you, and submit yourselves (a).* They are to be owned, loved, and highly esteemed, as those who are set over them in the Lord, as says the Apostle: *We beseech you, Brethren, to know them which labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you; and to esteem them very highly in Love for their Works sake (b).* Let the Elders who rule well, be counted worthy of double Honour, especially they who labour in the Word and Doctrine (c). So that our Scheme is not so wild and giddy, nor so full of Confusion, as Mr. H. in his loose way of representing it, falsely suggests; but regular, sober, and religious, according to the Apostolick Pattern. From hence Mr. H. may be convinced, that what evil Consequences soever happen in this Scheme, they are only accidental, and arise from the Corruptions of Mens Minds, and not from the Falseness of the Scheme. The sad Consequences, which our Blessed Lord foretold would follow the Preaching the Gospel, may be as justly attributed to the Gospel, as those Irregularities, and evil Consequences, which Mr. H. mentions, may be imputed to this Scheme.

Tho, says Mr. H. p. 46. *I studiously avoided any notice of Mr. D's Stile and Manner, I can't forbear laying before the Reader his Accuracy upon the word κληρῆς, p. 44. To keep the People in Ignorance of their antient Right, and to establish themselves in their Usurpation, they cunningly contrived to call themselves the Church, as tho they were God's peculiar Portion, his κληρῆς, distinct from the People, when God knows they are the least part of it.* Tho I have studiously resolved to be serious, and not to treat of religious Affairs ludicrously; yet I cannot forbear smiling, to see this Reverend Divine going back twenty Pages to fetch up an Instance of my Accuracy, which happen'd to be left behind. Was the Rector asleep when he

(a) Heb. xiii. 17. (b) 1 Thess. v. 12, 13. (c) 1 Tim. v. 17.
pass'd

pass'd by it? Or was it forgot, till some kind Neighbour was so friendly as to be his Remembrancer? In this he has acted as wise a part, as that Emperor (a), who, when he should be attending the weighty Affairs of Government, was found catching Flies. Mr. H. in these words, it seems, minded the Accuracy upon the word κληρος, which is a Trifle, and not worth regarding, in comparison with the Truth thereby express'd. Why had not Mr. H. deny'd, that the Clergy did call themselves the Church? Or why had he not proved, that they alone were the Church? Or if they were not the Church, yet it was their Right, and no Usurpation to do what of Right did really belong to the Church to do? But he was so prudent as to pass this by, and only propose to lay before his Reader my *Accuracy on the word κληρος*, which whether accurately express'd or not, affects not the Truth therein contain'd at all; for Truth is Truth, tho inaccurately express'd. I therefore now desire Mr. H. to manifest, that the Clergy alone, distinct from the Laity, are the Church; or to shew, that the Clergy don't call themselves the Church, tho they are but a part of it, and a small part too. But wherein does this *Accuracy* of mine appear? I wish he had been more accurate himself in his Account of it. But instead of that, he says; *This Author might have borrowed the learned Mistake of Rigaltius, or the petulant Wit of the Independent Whig, to have graced this Reflection.* Does this learned Gentleman mean by the *learned Mistake of Rigaltius*, the *Accuracy of the word κληρος*? If he does, let him undertake to shew, that *Rigaltius* was mistaken in his Account thereof, which, I think, is beyond his Skill to do. Or does he mean, by the *Accuracy of the word κληρος*, the same as by the word *Reflection*? If so, one would wonder how such an accurate Writer as Mr. H. is, should make so gross a Mistake (but Passion will ruffle the Mind, and cloud the brightest Understanding) to confound *Reflection* with *Accuracy*; for tho a *Reflection* may be accurately express'd, yet *Reflection* is not *Accuracy*, nor *Accuracy Reflection*. In what follows, Mr. H. seems to suppose, that I misunderstood, or misapply'd the word κληρος. It commonly signifies *Lot*, *Portion*, and *Inheritance*; and this Mr. H. owns in the

(a) Domitian.

next Paragraph. The Church, or People of *Israel*, were called God's *Inheritance*, *Deut. iv. 20.* The *Septuagint* renders the words *ἐναὶ ἐν ᾧ λαὸν καὶ κληρονομίαν σου*. So again, — *ix. 29.* *They are thy People, and thy Inheritance,* the *Septuagint*, *λαὸς σου καὶ κληρονομία σου*. The *Hebrew* (a) in both Places signifies *Possessio* or *Sors*. As God thus calls his People *Israel* in general (b), so he calls himself their *Portion, Lot, or Inheritance.* *Jer. x. 16. & li. 19.* *The Portion of Jacob is not like them.* But here 'tis to be observ'd, that in these Places neither the *Hebrew*, nor the *Septuagint*, have the same Words as before. In *Ezekiel, chap. xlv. 28.* God styles himself the *Lot, Portion, or Inheritance* of the Priests in particular; but I no where find, that the Priests, or Levites, as distinct from the rest of God's People, are called God's *κληρονομία*, or *peculiar Portion*. Those Texts Mr. H. refers us to in his Margin, come far short of it. *Numb. iii. 12.* says, *The Levites shall be mine, i.e. my Priests to serve at my Altar:* but not one word of *Lot, peculiar Portion, or Inheritance*, distinct from the rest. *Numb. xvi. 5.* says, *Him whom God hath chosen, shall come near him;* but not a word of the Priest's being God's *peculiar Portion*. Besides, the Controversy in this Text was not between the Priests and People, but between the Levites themselves, who should have the chief Post at the Tabernacle. I wonder how Mr. H. could mention this place, which is so very far from his purpose, as a Distinction between Priests and People. But 'tis still more strange, that he should refer us to *Jos. xiii. 33.* unless he intends to prove, *quidlibet ex quolibet*, that because God calls himself the *Inheritance of the Tribe of Levi;* therefore the Priests, distinct from the People, are God's *peculiar Inheritance*. These are Mr. H's main Proofs from Scripture, that the Clergy are God's *peculiar Inheritance*, his *κληρονομία*, distinct from the People.

Let us next hear what he has to say from Ecclesiastical Writers. *St. Cyprian*, says he, *is full of this Distinction.* But where, he is not so good as to acquaint his Reader. That *St. Cyprian* distinguishes between *Laity* and *Clergy*, is clear to any body that reads him; but that he is full of this Distinction, that the *Clergy* are

God's *peculiar Portion*, in contradistinction from the People, we must suspend our Faith, till Mr. H. directs us to the Places.

Tertullian *has it*, says he. But where? This is a Secret too.

Eusebius likewise cites *Clemens Alexandrinus* for it, *lib. 3. cap. 23. Ed. Vales.* For what does he cite him? That the Priests were God's *peculiar Portion*, distinct from the People? But why had not Mr. H. given us *Clemens* his Words from *Eusebius*? It looks more than a little suspicious, that so many Writers should be cited, and none of their Words produced. But for the Reader's Satisfaction, I will give him *Eusebius's* Citation from *Clemens*. 'The Apostle *John*, says *Clemens*, 'went to the neighbouring Provinces, in some Places 'constituting Bishops, in others settling and forming 'whole Churches, and in others electing some one or 'other *into the Clergy*, who were signified to him by 'the Spirit (a).' Some were, it seems, by *John* elected *into the Clergy*; ergo, the Clergy were God's *peculiar Portion*, his *κληρὸς*. Hence we may see the true Reason why Mr. H. did not, nor durst give the Author's own Words, because they are so foreign to his purpose. But at the same time the Reader may perceive how foully Mr. H. would impose on his Credulity, if he will take his word without Examination.

Mr. H. says, *The other Clement, if we are not arguing about Words only, makes the Ministers Functions distinct, and then why not their Names?* I answer, *Their Functions and Names too*, with all my heart. But what is that to their being God's *peculiar Portion*, or *κληρὸς*? Does either of the *Clements* say, that the Clergy are the Church, or God's *peculiar Portions*, his *κληρὸς*, distinct from the People? Not one word of it, as I can find. This word is sometimes used in the *New Testament* for the People, distinct from the Priests; but no where for the Priests distinct from the People: therefore for the Priests to appropriate it to themselves, as tho they were God's *peculiar Lot*, or *Portion*, distinct from the People, is an Abuse of it, contrary to its Use in the Word of God. And for the

(a) "Ὅπερ ὁ κληρὸς ἕνα γὰρ τινὰ κληρώσων τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος σημαζομένων.

Clergy thence to call themselves the *Church*, is the way cunningly to rob the People of their Right, first, by usurping their Title, and then their Power. The Reader may find the word *κληρὸς* in these Places following, which he may consult at his leisure, and see where he can find it appropriated to the *Clergy*, now so called; that is, the *Priests* distinct from the *People*. *Mat.* xxvii. 35. *Mark* xv. 24. *Luke* xxiii. 34. *Jobu* xix. 24. *Acts* i. 26. in all which Places it signifies properly a *Lot*. In *Acts* i. 25. we render *κληρὸν τῆ διακονίας ταύτης*, part of the Ministry. *Acts* xxvi. 18. *κληρὸν ἐν τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις*, Inheritance among them that are sanctify'd. *Colos.* i. 12. τῷ κλήρῳ τῶν ἁγίων, of the Inheritance of the Saints in Light. Mr. H. will not say, 'tis in any of these places to be appropriated to the *Priests*, distinct from the *People*, I presume. In *1 Pet.* v. 3. we find, *Μηδ' ὡς κατακυριεύοντες τῶν κληρῶν*, which we render, Neither as being Lords over God's Heritage; so that the *Flock of God*, the *People*, contrary to Mr. H. are God's *κληρὸς*, his peculiar Portion, distinct from the *Priests*, who are to be their Overseers, and to feed them.

Mr. H. says, *If the Jewish Priesthood was in great Honour, why not the Christian?* I say, let the Christian Priesthood have all the Honour which is justly due to them by the Laws of Christ. God forbid that I should detract the least jot from the just Rights and Honour of the Christian Priesthood. Mr. H. is greatly mistaken, if he thinks that I would lessen the just Rights and Privileges of the Gospel Ministry. No; I am only for preventing the unjust Encroachments of the Priesthood on the Laity, and for restoring to the People their just Rights, upon the true Protestant Foundation, against the base and palpable Usurpation of the *Romish* Clergy; who have shut out the People from having any hand in electing their own Pastors; who, instead of freely chusing them by their Suffrage, as in times past, must have 'em imposed on them, without their previous Knowledge or Consent: only in a ludicrous manner, a Deacon shall call out, they say, and require the People to object, if they have any thing against the Man, when nobody knows him, or any thing of him.

The *Romish* Priests are not called *Usurpers* by me, for asserting their *Authority and Title*, that's a false Insinuation

tion of Mr. *H.* but because they call themselves what they are not, *i.e. the Church*, and because they assume a Power to impose upon the People Pastors against their wills, which the King of Heaven hath not granted to them. Nor would they willingly consent, that any of the *Kings of the Earth* should be allowed any share in this their Power; for they have gone so far in their Usurpations, as not only to wrest the Power out of the hands of the People, but they contest it with Kings of the Earth too. Mr. *H.* cannot be ignorant of this Usurpation abroad: nor who has pleaded for it, and attempted it among the Protestant Clergy at home. Sure Mr. *H.* cannot be so very forgetful of, or so much unacquainted with the Affairs of his own Church, as not to know that *Lay Deprivations* in this Kingdom, and in the establish'd Church, have made a great noise in our own time, and how the Authority of the Lay Powers has been contested in this case. If these usurping Spirits could carry their point, no King upon Earth should have any share with them in this Power.

Mr. *H.* very gravely says, *If we may believe the Scripture, God's People are Kings, as well as Priests.* Who, I wonder, don't believe this? But what is this to the purpose? I hope, that if *God's People are Kings as well as Priests*, Mr. *H.* won't infer, that Priests are Kings too; that's the ready way to usurp not only all Ecclesiastical Power, but Civil too. And if so, God be merciful to the Laity! 'Tis bad enough now, but then woe will be to them. I can form no Ideas dark enough to represent the sad Estate the World must be in, if ever God should permit such a Mischief to befall it. May that Divine Goodness and Compassion, which has restrained this ambitious and usurping Spirit hitherto, that this Usurpation has made no greater Progress in this Kingdom, still put a check to it, and controul it, that it may never compass its dreadful Designs!

Mr. *H.* has the Goodness to recommend me to two worthy and learned Authors; Bishop *Fell*, and Mr. *Dodwell*. I thank him for his Civility, and in return, I recommend him to the Right Reverend and Worthy Protestant Prelates, the present Bishop of *Bangor*, and Bishop *Stillingfleet*, for a True, Protestant, and Christian Notion of this Matter.

Thus

Thus I have run thro Mr. H's elaborate *Considerations*, and I am not conscious to myself, that I have omitted any thing of moment in them. I hope the Reader will pardon me for taking notice of so many things not worthy of any Man's Regard. The only Excuse I have to make, is, that Mr. H's trifling so much, obliged me to trifle with him. For the future, the Reader may expect no more trouble of this kind either from Mr. H. or me, on this Subject. For, to be sure, he will not judge this Reply so *honest and learned*, as to deserve any further notice; and he hath obliged himself not to give his Reader any further trouble, unless I endeavour to write like an *honest Man, and a Scholar*.

F I N I S.

12 MR 58



ERRATA.

PAG. 7. lin. ult. read *them*. P. 24. l. 33. r. *an*. P. 29. l. 20. r. *needs*. P. 33. l. 16. r. *had*. P. 44. l. 6. r. *Lord*. P. 75. marg. r. *Socrat. Hist. lib. ii. c. 6*. P. 90. marg. r. *constitutum a*. P. 94. l. 12. r. *Convenience*. P. 101. marg. r. *Edit. 3*.

all
r-
ve
ne
y
H.
ot
ny
to
to

29.
nd.
ff
3'